सिद्धान्ताचार्य पं. फूलचंद जी शास्त्री,
निदेशक श्री गणेश वर्णी दि. जैन (शोध) संस्थान.
वाराणसी द्वारा भेंट

STUDIES IN BUDDHIST AND JAINA MONACHISM

श्री गणेश वर्णी दि. जैन (शोध) संस्थान
3354
नरिया, (का. हि. वि. वि.) वाराणसी

Dr. NAND KISHORE PRASAD

RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF PRAKRIT, JAINOLOGY
AND AHIMSA, VAISHALI
1972

.... प्राप्ति-संख्या........................

ग्रन्थ-कार्ड

श वर्णी दि० जैन (शोध) संस्थान

ग्रन्थागार

नरिया, वाराणसी-५

udies in Buddhist and

Jaina mona

chisn

and Kishor Prasad

सिद्धा[illegible] जी शास्त्री,
निदेशक [illegible] संस्थान.
वाराणसी द्वारा भेंट

Prakrit Jaina Institute Research Publication Series, Vol. 9

General Editor
DR. NATHMAL TATIA, M. A., D. Litt.

STUDIES IN BUDDHIST AND JAINA MONACHISM

BY
DR. NAND KISHORE PRASAD,
M. A., Ph. D.

Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology & Ahimsa,
Vaishali (Muzaffarpur)
Bihar

1972

All Rights Reserved

Price Rs.

Published on behalf of the Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology & Ahimsa, Vaishali (Muzaffarpur), BIHAR by Dr. Nathmal Tatia, M. A., D. Litt., Director.
Printed in India at the Tara Printing Works, Varanasi.

339८

Respectfully Dedicated

to

Professor Satkari Mookerjee

and

Dr. Nathmal Tatia

पमुट्ठम्हि च सुत्तन्ते अभिधम्मे च तावदे ।
विनये अविनट्ठम्हि पुन तिट्ठति सासनं ।।
महावग्गे

विणयो सासणे मूलं विणीतो संजतो भवे ।
विणया विप्पमुक्कस्स कतो धम्मो कतो तवो ।।
विशेषावश्यकभाष्ये

3395-

The Government of Bihar established the Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology & Ahimsa at Vaishali in 1955 with the object, inter alia, to promote advanced studies and research in Prakrit and Jainology, and to publish works of permanent value to scholars. This Institute is one of the five others planned by this Government as a token of their homage to the tradition of learning and scholarship for which ancient Bihar was noted. Apart from the Vaishali Research Institute, four others have been established and have been doing useful work during the last few years, namely, the Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning at Darbhanga, the K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute at Patna, the Bihar Rastra Bhasa Parishad for Research and Advanced Studies in Hindi at Patna and the Nalanda Institute of Research and Post-Graduate Studies in Buddhist Learning and Pali (the Nava Nalanda Mahavihara) at Nalanda.

As part of this programme of rehabilitating and reorientating ancient learning and scholarship this is the Research Volume No. IX which is the thesis of Dr. N. K. Prasad, approved for the Ph. D. degree of the University of Bihar. The Govt. of Bihar hope to continue to sponsor such projects and trust that this humble service to the world of scholarship and learning would bear fruit in the fulness of time.

3395

GENERAL EDITOR'S NOTE

The present work, originally entitled "A Comparative Study of the Buddhist Vinaya and Jaina Ācāra", is the approved thesis of Dr. Nand Kishore Prasad for the Ph.D. degree of the University of Bihar, Muzaffarpur. He worked on this topic for more than three years under my guidance and supervision.

There flourished in Bihar a good number of ascetic orders in and about 600 B.C., the prominent among those being the Jaina, the Ājivika and the Buddhist. Dr. Prasad took up a comparative study of the disciplinary codes of the two of these ascetic orders, *viz.*, the Buddhist and the Jaina. This study so far as I know is the first attempt of its kind.

The book is written in five chapters which have been further subdivided into sections. The 'Introductory' states the sources of the study after briefly discussing the meaning and scope of the terms *vinaya* and *ācāra*. The salient features of the Jaina and Buddhist monastic disciplines given in the first chapter are exhaustive and intend to acquaint even a tyro with the inner working of the Jaina and Buddhist orders. 'The background of the Buddhist Vinaya' traced out at the end of this chapter is original and revealing. The second chapter entitled 'The Order: Formation and Development' traces the origin and development of the Buddhist and Jaina orders and gives a comparative view of the rules regarding admission to and requisites of the orders

The third chapter deals with the monastic ceremonies. It consists of three sections dealing with the fortnightly meeting (*uposatha/posaha*), the rain-retreat (*vassāvāsa*) and the invitation for confession of faults (*pavāraṇā/khamāvaṇā*) respectively. The gradual change in the nature of the *upavasatha*, i.e., from fortnightly fast to confession of faults, traced out by the author evinces his penetrating grasp of the subject. The rain-retreat has been a practice prevailing commonly in ascetic orders, orthodox and heretical.

Of the three sections of the fourth chapter, the first two deal with monastic administration. The basic difference in the administrative pattern of the different churches has prevented the author from pointing out any instance of borrowing or adaptation. The exposition of the topic is however lucid and compact. The comparative view of the Buddhist *Prātimokṣa* and the Jaina *Prāyaścitta* in the third section of this chapter is a pioneer attempt of the author, which deserves attention of the reader.

The work is rounded off with a short conclusion in the fifth chapter.

My thanks are due to Dr. Atul Nath Sinha, a pupil of mine, for undertaking the strenuous work of reading through the proofs. I must also thank Shri Ramashankar Pandya, Proprietor, Tara Printing Works, for the quick printing of the book.

Vaishali
Dipavali
Mahavira Nirvāna Samvat 2499
November 5, 1972.

NATHMAL TATIA
Director,
Research Institute of Prakrit,
Jainology & Ahimsa.

PREFACE

During my stay at Nalanda for completing the M. A. course in Pāli, I had an opportunity to meet a group of Jaina monks and nuns headed by Acharya Shri Tulasi and closely observe the duties and responsibilities of Jaina monks. I found striking similarities and differences between the monastic rules and regulations of the Jaina and Buddhist Orders, and imbibed fascination for a critical and comparative study of the Buddhist Vinaya and Jaina Ācāra. After taking the M. A. degree in Pāli in 1959, I started studying the books of the Buddhist Vinaya and some of the important texts of Jaina Ācāra, namely, the *Ācārāṅgasūtra*, *Daśavaikālikasūtra*, *Uttarādhyayanasūtra*, *Kalpasūtra*, etc. The problems of the origin of the Buddhist Vinaya and the monastic order and its literature on discipline engaged my mind. I also tried to find out the process of evolution of the ordination ceremony and the ceremonies of *uposatha*, *vassāvāsa*, *pavāraṇā*, and the like. I was gradually convinced that a study of the corresponding Jaina ceremonies will be positively helpful in determining the process of evolution of the Buddhist ceremonies. I also found the Jaina concept of monastic administration as containing valuable materials for a comparative study of the monastic administration of the Buddhists. The Buddhist transgressions and expiations found their parallel in the Jaina books of discipline, which have been noticed in the body of the thesis in their proper contexts.

Scholars are now agreed that there were numerous ascetic sects wandering from one place to another in the eastern and central part of Northern India with flourishing centres at Śrāvastī, Vaiśālī, Rājagṛha and similar other places The sects of the Nirgranthas and the Ājīvikas were two very important communities of monks, well-established at the advent of the Buddha. The literature of the Ājīvika sect is irretrievably lost, and it is difficult to have a concrete idea of the influence of the Ājīvika monastic discipline on the evolution of the Buddhist Order. But fortunately the Jaina Ardhamāgadhī canon is still available as a fruitful source for tracing the origin of the rules of the Buddhist monasticism and the *Pātimokkha* rules.

In the present book an attempt has been made to find the influence of Jainism on the evolution of the Buddhist monachism in respect of the topics mentioned above. I should frankly admit that it has not always been possible for me to find a Jaina precursor of the Buddhist concept. I have however tried to unveil similarities hidden under deceptive terminology and it is for scholars to judge how far I have succeeded in this maiden attempt.

I should now give an abstract summary of the contents of the book stating the internal links between the topics selected for discussion.

In the first section of the first chapter, the Jaina concept of an ideal monk and rules and regulations pertaining to various aspects of monastic life, in one word, the salient features of Jaina Ācāra have been described. The essence of Jaina Ācāra is constituted by the trio of inoffensiveness, self-restraint and penance. Here we have discussed the qualifications for admission to the order, the causes of renunciation, the status of the newly initiated monk, the outfit of a Jaina monk and his daily duties. The requisites of a Jaina monk which correspond to the four *nissayas* of the Buddhist order have been discussed in detail. The wandering life of a Jaina monk and the principle of *ahiṁsā* as its guiding maxim have also been dealt with. A Jaina monk's life and a suitable residence during the rainy season have received our attention in the same section. The church units and the hierarchy of officers have been described from the original sources and a special note on the Jaina order of nuns and its relation to the monks have been attached. A Jaina monk's attitude towards heretics and towards his own laity has been explained. A special sub-section on the principle of *ahiṁsā* (non-injury) has been incorporated, followed by elaborate sub-sections on *saṁyama* (self-restraint) and *tapa* (penance).

The second section of the first chapter deals with 'the salient features of Buddhist Vinaya' followed by a separate sub-section on 'the background of the Buddhist Vinaya'. The salient features have been discussed under the captions 'the formation of the order', 'the requisites', 'monastic observances' and 'monastic administration'. Here we have briefly stated the process of and bars to admission, relation between a teacher and disciple, monks' relation with nuns and haretics, etc. The requirements of the Buddhist monks technically known as *nissaya* were four, *viz.*, food, dress, abode and medicaments. The Buddhist monastic observances comprise of *uposatha*, *vassāvāsa* and *pavāraṇā*. The Buddhist order was governed on democratic lines. It also appointed suitable officers for maintaing law and order in the church.

In 'the background of the Buddhist Vinaya' light has been thrown on the religious beliefs and practices that were in vogue at the advent of the Buddha. We have restricted ourselves only to those beliefs which had bearing on the monastic rules and regulations. At the time there were two broad camps in vogue, namely, *Akriyāvādins* and *Kriyāvādins*. The Buddha invented the middle path which sponsored a balanced life rejecting materialism on the one hand and dry formal asceticism on the other. In this connection we have referred to the *Nigganṭha cāturyāma-saṁvara* as an example of the second of the two extremes. The *dhutaṅgas* of the Buddhists have their precursor in the Jaina *dhutaṅgas* described in the *Dhuvaṅga Ajjhayaṇa* of the *Ācārāṅgasūtra.*

In the first section of the second chapter *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* (Pkt. *pavvajjā* and *uvaṭṭhāvanā*) have been discussed. These constitute two distinct successive stages of renunciation, the latter being the culmination to which one was entitled only after rigorous training in monastic life and fulfilment of an objective criterion. In this connection we have elaborately discussed the process of a candidate's admission to monkhood, both in the Jaina and the Buddhist church with concrete examples. Though the order of Jaina nuns appears to have been prevalent at the time, the Buddha agreed to admit nuns after a good deal of hesitation. The Digambara Jaina position in this respect has been noticed. The Buddha's imposition of harder rules and regulations on the order of nuns finds its prototype in the Jaina code for nuns. In this connection we have noted the interesting legend of Tīrthaṅkara Mallī. The question of the conversion of lay-disciples in both the churches has been dealt with in a sub-section. An elaborate treatment has been given to the causes of renunciation which is a continuation of the same topic dealt with in the first section of the first chapter. The circumstances and motives of renunciation discussed in the Buddhist canon do not differ essentially from those recorded in the Jaina Āgamas. The disqualifications of monastic admission to both the churches have been elaborately discussed. Special rules have been prescribed for such converts in the Buddhist canon. The rules prescribed for the monks as well as the laity of both the churches have been elaborately discussed from the original sources. The aspect of the Buddhist *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* as an ecclesiastical act (*saṅghakamma*) has received a special treatment in a sub-section with a comparative reference to the Jaina ceremony on the occasion. The conversion of the members of a heretic sect has received special attention in the Buddhist canon and special conditions have been laid for such conversion. The relation between the teacher and the disciple has been discussed at the end of the section.

In the second section of the second chapter the *nissayas*, that is, requisites of a monk has been discussed. These are food, robe, shelter and medicaments. The term corresponding to *nissaya* is wanting in the Jaina canon, though the Jaina monks also had to use them as the basic need of life. In connection with the first *nissaya*, namely, *piṇḍiyālopabhojana*, the nature of food allowed to the monks, and proper and improper articles of food and drink, prescribed and prohibited in both the churches have been described in detail. The nature of begging-bowl and the rules for its acquisition and preservation have next been discussed. The purpose of taking food, the quantity of food, the time for eating, the begging-round and similar matters have also been discussed. The second *nissaya* is *paṁsukūlacīvara*, that is, cloth procured from dust-heaps. In this connection we have referred to the nudity of Jaina monks. Material and colour of robes, preparation of robes, number and size of robes to be used have also been dealt with. Next we come to the third *nissaya*, namely, *rukkhamūlasenāsana*. Shelter is an essential requisite of life and even a monk could not ignore it. Elaborate rules were framed for the acquisition of shelter and articles of furniture. The Jainas reduced the need to its minimum. There was, of course, a movement within the Buddhist church headed by Devadatta to discard shelter, which was however unsuccessful. With the passage of time various types of abodes were accepted which in the centuries that followed became big centres of learning and meditation. The Jaina monks did not follow suit. But in later times sects of Jaina *yatis* emerged, which were used to live in fixed abodes and gathered huge libraries of literature, known as *Bhaṇḍāras* in the history of the Jaina church. Next we come to the fourth *nissaya* called *pūtimuttabhesajja*, i e., medicaments made of stinking-urine. Permission was also granted to use ghee, butter, oil, honey, etc. as medicine in both the churches. A list of important diseases and their cure has been added. With the enlargement of the order rules regarding ownership, succession, distribution and exchange of the requisites were framed, which have received elaborate treatment at the close of the section.

In the first section of the third chapter the *uposatha* ceremony has been described with a comparative reference to the Brahmaṇical *upavasatha* and the Jaina *posaha* or *pausadha*. The second section of the chapter deals with *vassāvāsa*. The universality of the custom of the *vassāvāsa* among the Indian mendicant orders and the causes leading to the institution of the custom in the Buddhist church have been stated. Period of retreat and their duration with a special reference to the Jaina custom have been clearly recorded. The preliminaries of *vassāvāsa* in both the churches and its indispensability with a list of the places where the Buddha and Mahāvīra are said to have spent their successive rainy seasons after the First Sermon in the case of the Buddha and right from the date of renunciation in case of the Mahāvīra have been appended. Special occasion for the interruption of the *vassāvāsa* and conditions for permanent transfer of places and places fit for observing the *vassā* in both the churches have also been given. The functions of the order during the *vassāvāsa* and special features of the retreat are added at the end of the section. The third section of the chapter deals with *pavāraṇā* which takes place on the completion of the *Vassāvāsa*. The nearest approximate Jaina concept corresponding to *pavāraṇā* is *khamāvaṇā* (*kṣamāpanā*), which is observed at the end of Jaina *pajjusana* of the Śvetāmbara sect and the *dasalakṣaṇaparva* of the Digambara.

The first section of the fourth chapter deals with the custodians of monastic discipline with following components—the church units and the hierarchy of officers. A comparison has been made of the Buddhist administration with Jaina hierarchy of officers namely, *ācārya*, *upādhyāya*, *gaṇadhara*, *gaṇi*, *gaṇāvacchedaka*, etc. The Buddhist administration appears more elaborate, practical and realistic. The Jaina church depended more on austerities and penance than on external legal acts of the order. The second section of the chapter deals with church polity with special emphasis on settlement of disputes by means of *adhikaraṇasamathas*. The scanty material on the subject, found in the Jaina canon, is recorded. The problem of seniority and succession in both the churches is also explained in this connection. The third section of the chapter is a comparative study of the Buddhist *Prātimokṣa* and the Jaina *Prāyaścitta*. In this connection we have dealt with the list of transgressions and expiations as prescribed in the Buddhist canon and compared them with similar classification referred to in the canonical texts of the Śvetāmbara sect. The Buddhists seem to have insisted mainly on mental purification while the Jainas both on mental as well as physical.

In the concluding chapter I have recorded the salient findings of my studies in their brief outlines.

I have recorded the result of my studies dispassionately and tried to keep away from prejudices and predispositions to the best of my ability. The extent of success achieved is to be judged by the critics. Jainism and Buddhism flourished side by side and influenced each other in the sphere of common interest. Our study is limited to the field of monastic life and administration, in one word, the external expression of a religious order. The points of agreement were necessitated owing to similar needs and necessities of life and the points of difference in many cases were dictated by the moral and mental maxims upheld by the two churches, the Buddhist and the Jaina.

Now I must place on record my obligation and indebtedness to my Gurus and well-wishers who helped me in the completion of my work in one way or the other. I express my deep sense of gratefulness to my Gurus, Professors Dr. Satkari Mookerjee, ex-Director, Nava Nalanda

Mahavihara, Nalanda and Dr. Nathmal Tatia, Director, Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology and Ahimsa, Vaishali, to whom this humble work is respectfully dedicated. As the Director of the Nava Nalanda Mahavihara, Professor Mookerjee not only encouraged me to carry on my work by awarding the research scholarship but also spared his valuable time, whenever I approched him for his assistance and advice. It is utterly impossible for me to place in writing the tremendous obligation I owe to Dr. Tatia. Besides his formal duty of a superviser, he did all which an affectionate Indian Guru can do for his pupil. I consider myself fortunate enough to sit at their pious feet like Ānanda who worked out his own salvation at the holy feet of the Buddha.

I acknowledge my gratefulness to my *alma mater*, the Nava Nalanda Mahavihara, Nalanda and the Research Institute of Prakrit, Jainology and Ahimsa, Vaishali, where I completed the present work. I must also express my indebtedness to the staff of these Institutes whose inspiring words were helpful to me in many ways. I shall be failing in my duty, if I do not remember my friends, Dr. Rai Ashwini Kumar and Dr. Atul Nath Sinha, on this occasion. I was immensely benefitted by their close association during my research period. Dr. Atul Nath Sinha deserves my heart-felt thanks for his alacrious assistance extended to me in the preparation of the index.

Vaishali
Dipavali,
November 5, 1972.

NAND KISHORE PRASAD

CONTENTS

General Editor's Note vii

Preface ix

Abbreviations xix

Introductory

- (*a*) The Meaning and Scope of the words Vinaya and Ācāra 1
- (*b*) The Sources of Study ... 2

CHAPTER I

The Jaina Ācāra and the Buddhist Vinaya 11–68

Section I : The Salient Features of Jaina Ācāra

- (*a*) The Jaina Order and other relevant rules ... 11
- (*b*) Ahiṁsā, the principle of non-injury ... 30
- (*c*) Saṁyama or self-restraint .. 33
- (*d*) Tapa or Self-mortification and penance ... 36

Section II : (A) The Salient Features of Buddhist Vinaya

- (*a*) The Formation of the Order ... 40
- (*b*) Requisites ... 48
- (*c*) Monastic Observances ... 55
- (*d*) Monastic Administration ... 58

(B) The Background of the Buddhist Vinaya

- (*a*) Pre-Buddhist Beliefs and Practices ... 61
- (*b*) Buddhist Standpoint ... 63
- (*c*) The Concession Allowed to the Ascetics ... 66

CHAPTER II

The Order : Formation and Development 71–156

Section I : Pabbajjā And Upasampadā

- (*a*) Pabbajjā and Upasampadā Connotated ... 71
- (*b*) The Process of Admission ... 74
- (*c*) Duties and obligations ... 89
- (*d*) The Causes of Renunciatiou ... 99

(e) Bars to Admission ... 100
(f) The Authotity competent to carry out the Function ... 105

Section II : Nissayas

(a) Piṇḍiyālopabhojona ... 110
(b) Paṁsukūlacīvara ... 128
(c) Rukkhamūlasenāsana ... 140
(d) Pūtimuttabhesajja ... 144
(e) Ownership, Succession, Distribution and Exchange of the Requisites ... 151

CHAPTER III

Monastic Ceremonies ... 159–194

Section I : Uposatha

(a) Brahmaṇical ... 159
(b) Buddhist ... 159
(c) Jaina ... 165
(d) Conclusion ... 168

Section II : Vassāvāsa

(i) Universality of the custom among Indian Mendicant Orders ... 169
(ii) The Causes of the Institution of the Retreat ... 170
(iii) Periods of Retreat and their duration ... 171
(iv) How to enter upon the Retreat ... 174
(v) The indispensability of the Retreat ... 176
(vi) Occasions for the interruption of the Retreat ... 179
(vii) Conditions for permanent transfer of the residence 181
(viii) Places fit for observing the Retreat ... 183
(ix) The Saṅgha-Kammas performed during the Retreat ... 186
(x) Corporate life ... 186
(xi) Some privileges due to the Institution of the Retreat ... 186
(xii) Some special features of the Jaina Retreat ... 188
(xiii) Conclusion ... 190

Section III: Pavāraṇā ... 191

CHAPTER IV

Monastic Administration 197-240

Section I: The Custodians of Monastic Discipline

1. The Church Units

(a) Buddhist ... 199
(b) Jaina ... 200
(c) Conclusion ... 202

2. Hierarchy of Officers

(a) Buddhist ... 203
(b) Jaina ... 207
(c) Conclusion ... 212

Section II: The Laws of Polity

(a) Buddhist ... 213
(b) Jaina ... 222
(c) Conclusion ... 224
(d) Problem of Seniority and Succession ... 224

Section III: The Buddhist Prātimokṣa and the Jaina Prāyaścitta: A Comparative Study ... 228

CHAPTER V

Conclusion 243-247

Bibliography ... 249
Index ... 257
Errata ... 282

ABBREVIATIONS

Anag
Angd } —*Anagāradharmāmṛta*
Antg —*Antagaḍadasāo*
Aup —*Aupapātikasūtram*
Āvas —*Āvassayasuyaṁ*
Āyār —*Āyāraṁgasuyaṁ*
B —*Bhāṣya*
Bhag —*Bhagavaīsuyaṁ*
Bṛhk —*Bṛhatkalpasūtram*
CV —*Cullavagga*
Dasā —*Dasāsuyakkhandhasuyaṁ*
Dasv —*Dasaveāliyasuyaṁ*
DN —*Dīghanikāya*
EBJ —*Early Buddhist Jnrisprudence*
EBM —*Eurly Buddhist Monachism*
EMB —*Early Monastic Buddhism*
HJM —*History of Jaina Monachism*
Kapp —*Kappasuyaṁ*
KN —*Khuddakanikāya*
MN —*Majjhimanikāya*
Mūl —*Mūlācāra*
MV —*Mahāvagga*
N —*Nijjutti*
Nāyā —*Nāyādhammakahāo*
Nirya —*Nirayāvaliyāo*
Nis —*Nisīhasuyaṁ*
Ogh N —*Oghanijjutti*
Pind N —*Piṇḍanijjutti*
PM —*Pātimokkha*
Samv —*Samavāyāṁgasuyaṁ*
SBE —*Sacred Books of the East*
Suyg —*Sūyagaḍaṁgasuyaṁ*
Tattva —*Tattvārthādhigamasūtram*
Ṭhān —*Ṭhāṇaṁgasuyaṁ*
Uttar —*Uttarajjhayaṇasuyaṁ*
Vav —*Vavahārasuyaṁ*

TRANSLITERATION

Vowels

अ	आ	इ	ई	उ	ऊ	ए	ऐ	ओ	औ
a	ā	i	ī	u	ū	e	ai	o	au

अं	अः
aṁ	aḥ

Consonants

क	ख	ग	घ	ङ
ka	kha	ga	gha	ṅa
च	छ	ज	झ	ञ
ca	cha	ja	jha	ña
ट	ठ	ड	ढ	ण
ṭa	ṭha	ḍa	ḍha	ṇa
त	थ	द	ध	न
ta	tha	da	dha	na
प	फ	ब	भ	म
pa	pha	ba	bha	ma
य	र	ल	व	श
ya	ra	la	va	śa

ष	स	ह	ळ
ṣa	sa	ha	ḷa

INTRODUCTORY

(A) The Meaning and Scope of the words Vinaya and Ācāra

It is a foregone conclusion that the term *Vinaya* stands for the complete set of rules and regulations laid down for the Buddhist Saṅgha. The antiquity of the term *Vinaya* can be ascribed to a date as early as the *Ṛg-Veda.*[1] For the Buddhists it is at least as old as their Faith itself. In spite of this striking similarity regarding the antiquity of the term, the Brahmaṇical sources are not in consonance with the Buddhist so far as the implication of the term is concerned. The former seems to have used it either in the sense of 'removing' or 'removal' which corresponds in meaning to the word '*vinayana*' occuring in the Buddhist sources.[2] The latter, besides emplying it for multiferious purposes appears to have used to denote a single rule on the one hand, and the whole treatise on discipline, on the other. Ultimately, all other uses and implications of the word fell into abeyance but the last, i. e , it began to signify the complete set of rules and regulations intended for the Buddhist Order. Ācārya Buddhaghosa subscribes to the same meaning when he remarks—"Because it shows precepts and principles, and governs both deed and word, therefore men call this scripture *vinaya*, for so is *vinaya* interpreted[3]".

Āyāra or Sanskrit *Ācāra*, like *Vinaya*, is also an old term. It means good conduct, usage, custom and the like,[4] the most popular and original being the first, i.e., good conduct. The Jaina Order ought to have adopted the term without bringing any alteration to its original sense, because both an ascetic and a householder (*sāvaka* and *sāvikā*) were on the same footing so far as the membership of the Order was concerned. But despite the fact its scope was limited by bringing a change in the meaning. Thus according to the Jaina Monachism the word *ācāra* implies 'the way of life of a Jaina monk'. Accordingly the book containing the rules of conduct to be observed by the monks was named *Ācārāṅga* or 'a trealise on (good) conduct'[5]. Though

---

1. Vide Macdonell, *A Practical Sanskrit Dictionary*, *Sub voce.*
2. Vide Rs. Davids, *Pali English Dictionary*, Sub *voce.*
3. vividhavisesanayattā vinayato ceva kāyavācānaṁ/
   vinayatthavidūhi ayaṁ vinayo vinayo ti akkhāto ti//
   Aṭṭhasālini, 1. 47, p. 17; cf. *Expositor.*
4. Vide Macdonell, *A Practical Sanskrit Dictionary*, *sub voce.*
5. On the analogy of the term *Vedāṅga* meaning 'a limb (for preserving the body) of the *Veda*' (*Vide* Monier Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*), the expression *Ācārāṅga* may also be interpreted as 'a limb or an organ (for preserving the body) of (good) conduct'.

the *Ācārāṅgasūtra* does not contain the entire set of rules and regulations binding on the Jaina Order, yet it is assumed to represent the rules in toto.

(B) The Sources of Study

A brief survey of the sources of study will not be entirely unprofitable. At the first place, it may be mentioned that the only purpose here is to introduce the books dealing with the monastic rules with reference to their utility and importance in point, and not to discuss them in their historical perspective. Our mission will be accomplished most successfully, if we take up the Buddhist and the Jaina sources separately.

It may be stated here that the main source of information as regards the conduct of the Buddhist monks and nuns in their daily life and the internal management of the Saṅgha is the Pāli texts which may aptly be discussed in two groups :–(a) the Canon or the Piṭakas and (b) the Commentaries or the Aṭṭhakathās. The Pāli Canon consists of three Piṭakas, viz. *Vinayapiṭaka, Suttapiṭaka* and *Abhidhammapiṭaka*, each Piṭaka containing books as given below :

Vinayapiṭaka	*Suttapiṭaka*	*Abhidhammapiṭaka*
1. Mahāvagga	1. Dīghanikāya	1. Dhammasaṅgaṇi
2. Cullavagga	2. Majjhimanikāya	2. Vibhaṅga
3. Pārājika	3. Saṁyuttanikāya	3. Dhātukathā
4. Pācittiya	4. Aṅguttaranikāya	4. Puggalapaññatti
5. Parivāra	5. Khuddakanikāya	5. Kathāvatthu
		6. Yamaka
		7. Paṭṭhāna.

The fifth nikāya of the *Suttapiṭaka*, the *Khuddakanikāya* contains the following fifteen books :

1. Khuddakapāṭha
2. Dhammapada
3. Udāna
4. Itivuttaka
5. Suttanipāta
6. Vimānavatthu
7. Petavatthu
8. Theragāthā
9. Therīgāthā
10. Jātaka
11. Niddesa
12. Paṭisambhidāmagga.
13. Apadāna.
14. Buddhavaṁsa
15. Cariyāpiṭaka

To ascertain the date of composition of the texts that go to form the Pāli Canon would, of course, entail a long discussion. It may however be opined in short that even the earliest text cannot be anterior to the First Sermon of the Buddha. Likewise the latest can in no case be posterior to the reign of king Vaṭṭagāmaṇi of Ceylon in whose time the Canon is alleged to have been committed to writing, or even if not so, then to the composition of the *Milindapañho*, a work of the first century A. D., in which the Pāli Canon or some portions of them are referred to. Thus probably the Pāli Canon was compiled and composed in between 600 B. C. and 100 A.D.[1]

It may aptly be remarked that for the history of the Buddhist Saṅgha the books on the *Vinaya* are of supreme importance while those of *Sutta* are of some profit, but those of *Adhidhamma* are of little account Naturally our knowledge of the Buddhist Saṅgha will be based on the books of the *Vinayapiṭaka* of the Theravāda School, though an effort to utilise the Vinaya texts of the Sarvāstivāda school will also be made with a view to make the study comprehensive.

What is true of the Piṭakas is, of course, applicable in case of their commentaries as well, i. e., the commentaries on the Vinaya are more useful for our purpose than the commentaries on the other Piṭakas. The utility of the commentaries lies in the fact that they explain the unintelligible terms and expressions, remove the vagueness of the original rule and somestimes also supplement it.

Among the good number of commentaries on the Vinaya, those written by Buddhaghosa and Buddhadatta Mahātheras are the most ancient and reliable. Others ascribed to a date much later than the former are steriotyped, for either they are sub-commentaries, or simply contain the Vinaya rules in an abridged form, or presuppose the commentaries of Buddhaghosa. Consequently it would be advisable to exploit the *Aṭṭhakathās* of Buddhaghosa only. Nevertheless, with a view to facilitate the task of the readers and the scholars, a list of the important commentaries and sub-commentaries on the Vinaya is appended here.

The Commentaries	*The Commentators*
1. Samantapāsādikā (A Commentary on the Vinaya)	—Buddhaghosa Mahāthera
2. Sāratthadīpanī Ṭīkā (A Commentary on *Samantapāsādikā*)	—Sāriputta Thera of Ceylon
3. Samantapāsādikā Yojanā	—Jāgarā Thera
4. Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī or Mātikaṭṭhakathā (A Commentary on the *Pātimokkha*)	—Buddhaghosa Mahāthera
5. Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī Ṭīkā or Vinayatthamañjūsā	—Buddhanāga Thera

---

[1] Law, *A History of Pāli Literature*, pp. 11-12.

6. Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī Abhinavaṭīkā	—Unknown
7. Kaṅkhāvitaraṇīgaṇṭhī	
8. Kaṅkhāyojanā	
9. Kaṅkhāyojanā Mahāṭīkā	
10. Pātimokkhapadaṭṭhavaṇṇanā	
11. Pātimokkhavisodhanī	—Disciple of Bhikkhu Sāriputta of Ceyon
12. Vinayavinicchaya	—Buddhadatta Mahāthera
13. Vinayavinicchaya Ṭīkā	—Vācissara
14. Uttaravinicchaya	—Buddhadatta Mahāthera
15. Uttaravinicchaya Ṭīkā	—Vācissara
16. Vimativinodanī Ṭīkā	—Koliyakassapa Mahāthera
17. Vajirabuddhi Ṭīkā or Vinayagaṇṭhī	—Mahāvajirabuddhi of Ceylon
18. Vinayagaṇṭhīpada	—Bhikkhu Moggallāna of Ceylon
19. Pālimuttakavinayasaṅgaha or Vinayasaṅgaha-aṭṭhakathā or Mahāvinayasaṅgahappakaraṇa	—Sāriputta Thera of Ceylon
20. Mūlasikkhā	—Mahāsāmī
21. Mūlasikkhā Ṭīkā or Porāṇaṭīkā	—Vimalasāra
22. Mūlasikkhā Abhinavaṭīkā	—Vācissara
23. Sīmālaṅkārasaṅgaha	—Vācissara
24. Sīmālaṅkārasaṅgaha Ṭīkā	—Disciple of Bhikkhu Sāriputta of Ceylon
25. Khuddakasikkhā	—Dhammasāmī
26. Khuddakasikkhā Ṭīkā	—Mahāyasa
27. Khuddakasikkhā Abhinavaṭīkā	—Saṅgharakkhita Thera
28. Vinayālaṅkāraṭīkā (A Commentary on Vinayasaṅgaha)	—Tipiṭakālaṅkāra of Tiriyapabbata
29. Vinayālaṅkāra Anuṭīkā	—Unknown
30. Vinayaguḷhatthadīpanī	—Disciples of Bhikkhu Sāriputta of Ceylon
31. Vinayasamuṭṭhānadīpanī	
32. Terasakaṇṇaṭīkā	—Bhadanta Sāriputta Thera
33. Sumaṅgalappasādanī	—Saṅgharakkhita Thera
34. Pārājikakaṇḍayojanā	—Unknown
35. Pācityādiyojanā	

So far as the sources of information about the Jaina Order are concerned the Āgamas, i. e., Canonical texts together with their exegetical literature, epigraphs and the paṭṭāvalis are worth mentioning Particularly the former is of great account as it gives all round knowledge of the Jaina Church. Other sources like the epigraphs, the paṭṭāvalis, etc. occupy also a significant position not because they contain a complete picture of the inner working of the Jaina Order but because they substantiate and supplement the statement forwarded by the Canon.

Both the Digambaras and the Śvetāmbaras claim to possess a separate collection of Canonical texts, each discrediting the authenticity of the other.[1] No wonder, if the Digambaras challenge the authenticity of the Śvetāmbara Canon because the Śvetāmbaras themselves are not sure of the total number of books, the Canon consists of. However the books comprising the Śvetāmbara Canon are classified into the following six groups[2]:

(a) *The Aṅgas* :

(i) Āyāraṅga
(ii) Suyagaḍaṅga
(iii) Ṭhāṇaṅga
(iv) Samavāyāṅga
(v) Viyāhapaṇṇatti (also called Bhagavaīsuya)
(vi) Nāyādhammakahāo
(vii) Uvāsagadasāo
(viii) Antagaḍadasāo
(ix) Anuttarovavāiyadasāo
(x) Paṇhāvāgaraṇāiṁ
(xi) Vivāgasuya
(xii) Diṭṭhivāya (not extant).

(b) *The Upāṅgas* :

(i) Ovavāiya
(ii) Rāyapaseṇaijja
(iii) Jīvābhigama
(iv) Pannavaṇā
(v) Sūriyapaṇṇatti
(vi) Jambuddivapaṇṇatti
(vii) Candapaṇṇatti
(viii) Niryāvalio

---

[1] *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. VIII, p. 29; *HJM*, p. 23.

[2] Scholars are not unanimous about the total number of books of the Śvetāmbara canon. Prof. Kapadia gives a list of 84 books (Vide *Canonical literature of the Jainas*, p. 58), while scholars like Winternitz (*History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, pp. 428-30) and Weber (*Indian Antiquary*, Vols. XVII-XXI) refer to the list we have followed. Vide also *HJM*, pp. 16-18.

(ix) Kappāvaḍaṁsiāo
(x) Pupphiāo
(xi) Pupphacūliāo
(xii) Vaṇhidasāo,

(c) *The Mūlasuttas* :

(i) Uttarajjhayaṇa
(ii) Dasaveyāliya
(iii) Āvassaya
(iv) Piṇḍaṇijjutti
(v) Oghaṇijjutti[1],

(d) *The Cheyasuttas* :

(i) Nisīha
(ii) Mahānisīha
(iii) Vavahāra
(iv) Dasāsuyakkhandha (also known as Āyāradasāo)
(v) Kappa (also called Bṛhatkalpa)
(vi) Pañcakappa (some put Jīyakappa),

(e) *The Paiṇṇas* :

(i) Causaraṇa
(ii) Āurapaccakkhāṇa
(iii) Bhattapariṇṇā
(iv) Saṁthāra
(v) Taṇḍulaveyāliya
(vi) Candavijjhaya
(vii) Devindatthava
(viii) Gaṇivijjā
(ix) Mahāpaccakkhāṇa
(x) Vīratthava,

(f) *Miscellaneous texts* :

(i) Nandi
(ii) Aṇuyogaddāra.

Strictly speaking none of the six groups deals exclusively with the origin and development of the Jaina Church as is the case with the *Vinayapiṭaka*. Notwithstanding, the *Aṅgas*, the *Cheyasuttas* and the *Mūlasuttas* together with their exegetical literature play, for the history of the Jaina Monachism, a role similar to that of the *Vinayapiṭaka* and its commentary.

---

[1] *Oghaṇijjutti* is not always taken as a component part of the Canon. Sometimes, *Piṇḍaṇijjutti and Oghaṇijjutti* are stated to form the group of the *Chedasūtras*. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, pp. 465.

As the space at our disposal is limited, it is not advisable to hazard a long discussion about the date of composition of the books that go to form the Śvetāmbara Canon. It may however be observed in brief that "The earliest portions of the canon may........., quite possibly belong to the period of the first disciples of Mahāvīra himself, or at the latest to the second century after Mahāvārā's death—the period of the Maurya Chandragupta, in which tradition places the council of Pāṭaliputra—whilst the latest portions probably be dated nearer the times of Devardhi. Thus the probable period of composition and compilation of the Śvetāmbara Canon is between 600 B. C. and 600 A. D [1]"

Among the texts forming the Digambara Canon which are grouped under the headings (a) the *Aṅgas*, (b) the *Aṅgabāhyas*, and (c) the *Aṇuyogas*, the texts belonging to the first two groups which in several cases correspond to the texts forming the Śvetāmbara Canon, e. g., *Ñātṛdharmakathāṅga*[2], are in no way less informative. Other texts like *Mūlācāra*, etc. which belong to the third group, the *Aṇuyogas*, most often, give new information about the history of Jaina monachism. The materials supplied by all these texts have been exploited to record the points of convergence and divergence between the two sects of the same monastic movement.

Besides, the vast exegetical literature which developed round the Canon is on no account less significant. It throws a flood of light on the canonical texts which "are written in a dry-as-dust, as a matter of fact, didactic tone, and.........are seldom instinct with general human interest"[3]. Furthermore "the exegetical literature is of importance from the point of view of social traditions, peculiar customs and practices mentioned in it, as also due to references to several religious sects, schisms and faiths. Thus they give us the social background to monastic practices and alterations in it, if any."[4]

---

1. *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, pp. 434-35; *Bṛhatkathākośa*, Introduction, p. 17.
2. *History of Indian Literature*, p. 473; Buhler's remarks, *Indian Antiquary*, Vide Vol. VII, p. 29.
3. *History of Indian Literature* Vol. II, p. 426; More or less Prof. Weber's remark is also to the same effect. Vide *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XVII, p. 290.
4. *HJM*. p. 29.

But for the enormous amount of work done in the field of Buddhist and Jaina studies by European and modern Indian scholars that this humble attempt of mine could not have been completed in time. Worthy of mention among the Buddhist scholars whose learned works in various forms opened the field for Buddhist ecclesiastical studies are Prof. H. Oldenberg, Prof. H. Kern, Prof. M. Winternitz, Prof R. S. Hardy, Prof. Rockhill, Mr. and Mrs. Rhys Davids, I. B. Horner, Dr. B. C. Law, Mahāpaṇḍita Rāhula Sankṛityāyana, Drs. N. Dutt, S. Dutt, and the like. Among European scholars whose scholarly contributions to Jaina studies are very helpful for Jaina monastic studies are Col. Mackenzie, George Buhler, Prof. H. Jacobi, Mrs. S. Stevenson, Dr. W. Schubring and several others. Among modern Indian scholars whose valuable works proved of much help for the purpose are Muni Jinavijayaji, Pt. Kalyāṇavijaya Gaṇī, Prof. H. R. Kapadia, Dr. P. L. Vaidya, Dr. A. N. Upadhye, Dr. H. L. Jain, and the remarkable work of Dr. S. B. Deo and others.

CHAPTER I

THE JAINA ĀCĀRA AND THE BUDDHIST VINAYA

Section I

The Salient Features of Jaina Ācāra

Section II

(A) The Salient Features of Buddhist Vinaya

(B) The Background of the Buddhist Vinaya

SECTION I

THE SALIENT FEATURES OF JAINA ĀCĀRA

"A careful perusal of the Jaina canon" remarks Prof. K. V. Abhyankar, "would show that the main theme of the canon is to define and illustrate monkhood,......".[1] In other words, the canon answers the question as to what true monkhood is ? True monkhood, according to the same source, does not consist in renouncing the world and discarding the use of excellent things simply because one cannot afford it. It consists, no doubt, in forsaking the world and finding no pleasure in worldly things even though abounding in them. This type of renunciation, we find, clearly illustrated in the following lines of the *Daśavaikālikasūtra* :

vatthagandhamalaṁkāraṁ itthio sayaṇāṇi ya |
acchandā je na bhuṁjanti na se cāī tti vuccai ||
je ca kante pie bhoe laddhe vi piṭṭhikuvvai |
sāhiṇe cayai bhoe se hu cāī tti vuccai ||[2]

It is for this type of persons that the Jaina canon defines and illustrates a rigorous course of discipline. These rules and regulations which pertain to various aspects of monastic life such as conversion of persons, acquisition of food and requisites by them, church units and officers, study, transgressions and punishments, and the like are developed to an uncomparable height. The most striking traits of these rules are that they presuppose the threefold principle of inoffensiveness, self-restraint and penance[3] or in the words of the rival religious sects self-mortication. The due or undue stress, for we cannot remark categorically at this stage, laid on the hair-splitting minuteness of the rules is, in all probability, with a view to keep this threefold principle scrupulously. These three main traits of the Jaina monastic rules, i. e., inoffensiveness, self-restraint and penance will follow after a brief introduction to the formation of the Jaina Order and some other relevant rules which are all helpful in the practice of the aforesaid three formulas.

(a) The Jaina Order and other relevant rules

Formation : Admission of candidates to the Order is one of the most important features of monachism. This is why the framers of

---

1. *Dasv*, Introduction, p. 1.
2. *Dasv*, 2.2-3.
3. dhammo maṁgalamukkiṭṭhaṁ ahiṁsā saṁjamo tavo-*Dasv*, 1.1.

the Jaina monastic rules seem to have laid great stress on the different aspects of admission which will be discussed in great detail in the section on initiation and ordination. For the time being, the following account will suffice.

In the beginning, everybody, irrespective of one's caste or social status, was allowed to enter the Order. This privilege to the general mass was stopped as soon as it was found impairing to the cause of the Order. Consequently, children under eight years of age, old men, eunuchs, sick persons, robbers, mad men, king's enemies, slaves, persons in debt, pregnant women, women having small children, so on and so forth were normally declared disqualified for monk life.[1] However the strictness of the rule was relaxed in exceptional cases. The cases of Atimuttaka[2] and Vaira[3] may be cited as instances in point, who were admitted at the age of six years[4] and six months respectively.

Causes of renunciation were numerous and of varied nature. Sometimes, anger, poverty, illness, disgust for worldly life or such other factor acted as a cause of renunciation.[5] At times, husband's becoming a monk constrained the wife to adopt nunhood[6] and son's taking to monk life inspired the parents to renounce the world[1]. Besides these instances of taking to monk life, many a time, people were either impressed by preaching religious discourse to bid farwell to household life[2] or were induced by different methods to do so[3].

---

[1] *Ṭhān*, 202, pp. 164b-165a.

[2] *Bhag*, 188, p. 219 b.

[3] *Cūrṇi* to *Āvas*, pp. 391 ff.

[4] Atimuttaka is named 'Kumārasamaṇa' which is explained as 'kumārasamaṇe'tti saḍavarasajātasya pravrajitvāt. *Bhag*, p. 219 b.

[5] Vide *Ṭhān*, 712, p. 473 b for ten causes of renunciation. Here I cannot help referring to an interesting episode which illustrates a peculiar cause of renunciation. It occurs in the *Āvaśyakasūtra* (*Bhāṣya* 141-144; *Vṛtti*, pp. 415-418) as below :

Once upon a time, there was a man named Sahaśramalla Śivabhūti. Once, Śivabhūti's wife lodged a complaint against him to her mother-in-law that, everyday, she had to wait for her husband till midnight as he did never come home before twelve in the night. Her mother-in-law, having made up her mind to wait for her son herself, asked her to shut up the door and go to bed. As usual Śivabhūti knocked the door in the dead of night. Then her mother, having rebuked him bitterly, asked to find out a door which might be open for him. He left his house in disgust and proceeded on his way. All of a sudden he came across a monastery of Jaina monks whose door was still open. He approached the monks and requested them for his conversion which they refused. But he started uprooting his hair himself. The monks, seeing him doing so, admitted him to the Order and left the place with him.

[6] Rājīmatī followed the foot-print of her would-be husband, Neminātha who took to monkhood having come to know that his wedding would cost many lives.—*Uttar*, xxii.

Whatever might have been the reasons of renuciation, the ceremony of conversion was solemnised with great pomp and festivity which mainly depended on the status of person seeking admission. As it was the last chance for the postulant to enjoy worldly pomp and luxury, he was dressed in gorgeous garments and then was brought to the place of conversion accompanied by pompous procession.

There the monk-to-be, after taking off his exellent garments and fineries, and putting on white robes, requested the teacher or the person concerned for conversion. The person concerned, after imparting religious instructions and making him acquainted with the pros and cons of ascetic life, inquired of him about his whereabouts and the purpose of renunciation. If his answer was satisfactory, then he was taught the necessary items of daily routine of a monk such as the way of worshipping the *cetiyas* and the *siddhas*, the process of *sāmāyika*, *pratikramṇa* (confession) and the rules of *iriyāpatha* (movement), etc. Then the entrant, after observing the necessary formalities of worshipping the *cetiyas* and the *vītarāgas*, uprooted handfuls of hair in order to show disgust with his body. After it, he had to recite the *sāmāyika* perambulating round the teacher thrice. The process of admission was completed with the offer of *rajoharaṇa* (duster) to the postulant by the teacher uttering the *maṅgalamantra.*[4]

The man joining the Order is called *seha*[5] (or *sekha*), *antevāsika*[6], *sāmaṇera*[7] or *khuḍḍaga*[8] and the women *khuḍḍiyā*[9], all of them denoting a person in want of training. They are, therefore, kept under the guidance of a learned and experienced teacher either for six months or for four months or for a week only.[10] During their probation they have to show complete obedience to their seniors and to learn the tenets of monkhood or nunhood as the case may be. After the successful completion of the training period, their admission is confirmed. After the confirmation, the monk is called *bhikkhu*, *nigganṭha*, *sāhu* or *thera*, and the nun, *bhikkhunī*, *nigganṭhī*, *sāhuṇī*, *ajjā* or *therī* and are treated as regular members of the Order. Now they are entitled to participate in any affair of their respective Order as well as to aspire and endeavour even for the highest position in the Church hierarchy.[1]

---

[1] *Uttar*, xiv.

[2] *Nāyā*, pp. 24ff.

[3] *Ṭhān*, 157, p. 128b; 355, p. 276a.

[4] Vide *Infra*, *Chap* I, Sec. I–Process of Admission.

[5] *Bhag*, 339, p. 382a.

[6] *Bhag*, 7, p. 11a ; *Nāyā* p. 163 ; *Ṭhān*, 320, p. 240a and *Vav*, 10.14 refer to four types of *antevāsika*.

[7] *Suyg* (*SBE*. Vol. XLV), p. 277.

[8] *Vav*, 10.17-20.

[9] Ibid.

[10] *Ṭhān*, 159, p. 129a; *Vav*, 10.16.

The appearance and the outfit of a Jaina monk : The Jaina monks must have been readily recognisable as they practised either complete nudity[2] or clad in white garments from great antiquity, quite distinct from the reddish-brown (*geruka*) dress of the Brahmaṇical ascetics and saffron-coloured (*kasāya*) robes of the Buddhist monks, two of the main sects of the Indian mendicants. Another distinctive feature of the Jaina monks was that they either got their hair and whiskers shaved or clipped leaving on their heads hair only four-finger long[3] or as long as that of cows[4]. Besides garments, other requisites which they always kept with them for the sake of self-control or out of a sense of shame[5] were pot (*pāya*), blanket (*kambala*), duster (*pāyapuñchaṇa*, *gocchaga* or *rayaharaṇa*)[6] and a mouth-covering-cloth (*muhapotti*)[7]. The pot was in all cases never metallic but made of gourd, wood or clay.[1] Most probably *pāyapuñchaṇa* was the same as *rayaharaṇa* which was used for making the place of lying, sitting standing and walking lifeless. The use of a *muhapotti* to prevent killing of microscopic insects was a practice peculiar to the Jainas. Besides, a sect of the Śvetāmbara monks, like the Brahmaṇical ascetics, also had a staff or *daṇḍa*.[2]

---

[1] For all these references Vide *Vav*, 10.16-35; *Nāyā*, p. 163; *Ṭhān*, 159, p. 129a ; 320, p. 240a; etc.

[2] In the *Uttarādhyayanasūtra*, *Ajjhayaṇa* No. 23, there is a dialogue between Gautama Indrabhūti, a disciple of Lord Mahāvīra and Keśi, a follower of Lord Pārśva's sect, which refers to the monks to the Pārśva's sect as hearing an inner and an upper garment (*santaruttara*) and the disciples of Lord Mahāvīra as naked. Though the antiquity of the *Ajjhayaṇa* may be questioned, there is no doubt that the followers of Pārśva did not practise nudity which was most probably introduced by Lord Mahāvīra in imitation of the custom prevalent among the Ājīvika sect. It is probable that among the followers of Lord Mahāvīra also there were monks who used clothes, and that explains the initiation of women in Jaina Church from the very beginning. In latter times, with the cleavage of the Jaina Church into Śvetāmbara and Digambara, nudity came to be regarded as an essential feature of monkhood in the Digambara camp which consequently stopped admission of women to the Church.

[3] *Nāyā*, p. 30.

[4] *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 308.

[5] *Dasv*, 6.20; *Ṭhān* 171, p. 138a adds disrespect from people as the third reason.

[6] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 1. 2. 5. 3 (p. 23); 1. 6. 2. 1 (p. 55); *Bhag*, 267, p. 291a; 289, p. 309b; *Uttar*, 26. 23.

[7] *Uttar*, 26. 23; *Bhag*, 111, p. 139a; *Nis*, 4. 24; *OghN*, 288, p. 117a; 511, p. 175b; 628, p. 198b; 711-12, p. 214b.

3395

This was in brief the outward appearance of the Śvetāmbara monks. The Digambara ascetics, as they lived naked (*jahajāya*)[3] and took food in the palms of their hands (*pāṇipāya*)[4] actually had no outfit except a feather-broom (*picchıya*)[5] corresponding to the Śvetāmbara *pāyapuñchaṇa* or *rayaharaṇa* and a *kuṇḍi* (water-pot)[6].

As the requisites allowed to the nuns were almost the same as to the monks, their appearance was very similar to monks. A nun whether belonging to the Śvetāmbara or Digambara[7] sect always used white robes, for neither the Śvetāmbaras nor the Digambaras advocated nudity for nuns.

Thus the main signs of a Jaina monk or a nun were his or her white robes which were three in number, begging-bowl, duster and the mouth-covering-cloth,[8] the first and the last signs distinguishing him or her from the rest of the Indian ascetics. In this guise the monks and the nuns travelled from one place to another in the dry seasons bare-footed and without umbrella[9] not sticking to a place more than five nights.

Daily duties of a Jaina monk : The Jaina monks, as a matter of fact, lead a very strenuous life throughout the whole day and night and try their best to stick to their daily duties even in course of tour. They divide the whole of the day and the night into eight equal parts called *porisī*, four of the day[10] and four of the night[11]. The duties to be performed in each of the eight *porisīs* are prescribed thus in the *Uttarādhyayanasūtra*.

---

[1] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.6 1.2-5 (pp. 166ff); *Ṭhān*, 170, p. 138a.

[2] *Nis*, 1.40; *Bhag*, 333, p. 374b; *OghN*, 730, p. 218a.

[3] *Mūl*, 9. 15; 10.17-22.

[4] Ibid, 9. 45-54.

[5] *Bhagavatī Ārādhanā*, 6.38.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Regarding nuns among the Digambara sect Vide *HJM*, pp. 497f.

[8] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 1.7.4 (pp. 67-69); Ibid, p. 67, fn. 3.

[9] Perhaps the use of umbrella was sanctioned to old monks only, *Vav*, 8-5.

[10] *Uttar*, 26. 11.

[11] Ibid, 26. 17.

The first and the foremost duty of a monk after rising early in the morning, perhaps after attending the calls of nature, is to scan his requisites carefully and to remove insects found therein to a place of safety.[1] Then he should do the works of his *ācārya*, if asked for any, or devote the rest of the first *porisī* in study. This is in brief the daily routine of a Jaina monk to be followed in the first *porisī* of the day. In the second *porisī* he should practise meditation and in the third he should go on begging.[2] The item of begging food and drink may be omitted in case of illness (*āyaṁke*), disaster (*uvasagge*), for the sake of tolerance (*titikkhaya*), in order to preserve one's chastity and *guptis*, out of compassion for living beings, in the interest of penance or fast unto death (*sarīravocchеyaṇaṭṭhāē*).[3]

Study forms the main item of the fourth *porisī*.[4] The different texts furnish us with certain details and also refer to a number of technical terms connected with study, some of them being *sajjhāya*, *vāyaṇā*, *paḍipucchaṇā*, *pariyaṭṭaṇā*, etc.[5] The place of study is called *nisīhiyā*[6] which should be free from bones, flesh, blood, etc.[7] Study can be stopped in cases of fall of meteors, lightening, etc.[8] During the rest of the *porisī* a monk should pay reverence to his *gurū*, perform *kālapratikramaṇa* (confession of sins concerning time), and inspect his lodging and the place of easing nature in the closing part of the fourth *porisī*. Then he should practise the *kāyotsarga* posture without feeling any pain. Lastly he should confess his transgressions committed during the day before the *ācārya* and should seek absolution therefrom.[9]

The routine to be followed in the night is almost identical with that of the day, i.e., in the first and the fourth *porisīs* of the night a monk should study; in the second, he should meditate; and in the third, he should go to bed.[10]

---

1. *Uttar*, 26. 21–31.
2. Ibid, 26. 12.
3. Ibid, 26. 35.
4. *Ṭhān*, 285, p. 213 b; *Nis*, 19.8; *Uttar*, 26. 37.
5. Vide Schubring, *Doctrines of the Jainas* p. 267.
6. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.9 ; 2.2.1.1, pp. 179, Nisīhiyā also means study-tahappagāre uvassae no ṭhānaṁ (religious posture) vā sejjaṁ (night's rest) vā nisīhiyaṁ (study) vā ketejjā.–Ibid, 2.2.1.1, p. 120.
7. *Ṭhān*, 714-15, pp. 475b-476a.
8. Ibid, 714, pp. 475b-476a.
9. *Uttar*, 26.37-43.
10. Ibid, 26. 44-53.

It is remarkable that a Jaina monk neither cleanses teeth nor takes bath, and hence, these are not enumerated in the list of the daily duties of a mendicant.

The requisites of a Jaina monk : As the practice of ideal conduct depends mainly on acceptable food, proper dress and suitable abode, the Jaina Order seems to be careful enough as regards the same. It recommends not only to the mendicants but also to the laities, though not with the same strictness as in the case of the former, a life of rigour and severity. The sole aim behind this being the practice of *aparigraha* (non-possession of property), the material articles allowed to the monks are very few and limited in number and kind. This effort of the mendicants to observe poverty scrupulously enabled a group of them to abstain from the use of cloth even. Other regulations regarding the material needs of monks are also marked by the same type of serverity which will be manifest in the ensuing discussion.

1. *Begging and food* : The rules to be followed in respect of food were indeed very difficult and troublesome. Under no circumstances, a monk was permitted to hoard articles of food.[1] So also, cooking food by their own hands[2] or accepting food purposely prepared, purchased or borrowed for monks[3] was not permissible to them. They were to depend on food gathered from begging only, and that too must be acceptable, procured from a proper donor and in a lawful way. The offences which pertained to the nature (of food), the purpose and the method of its preparation *(udgama)*, the ways and means adopted in its acquisition (*utpāda*), the ways of offering and accepting *(eṣaṇā)* and the way of eating (*paribhoga*) were forty-two in number.[4]

Normally, the monks set out for begging in their complete outfit[5] when there was no rain, mist, gale or insects in the sky[6]. On the journey they tried to avoid a road full of living beings, pits, uneven ground, pillars, mud, bridges, embers, ashes or cow dung[7]; or the company of a householder or a heretic[8]. So also their best efforts was to keep themselves away from the vicinity of courtezans, a dog, a recently delivered cow, a wild bull, horse or elephant, a scene of play, quarrel or fight, the houses of kings, officers[1] and relatives[2]. Thus causing no injury either to living beings or to their own person or celibacy they were to beg alms within an area of half a *yojana* all around the place of their stay.[3] They were to reach the house of a donor when the food was ready.[4] As it was feared to result in the loss of celibacy, destruction of life, obstruction to other monks and lastly exciting anger of the householders; sitting in the house of a donor was not allowed to a monk moving for alms.[5] Only a monk overpowered with old age, ailing from some illness or practising penance was allowed to do so.[6]

---

[1] *Dasv*, 8 24; 6. 18 & 10.8 forbid even overnight possession of food.

[2] A monk is not allowed to do any fire activity.—*Dasv*, 8.8.

[3] Ibid, 5-1. 55; 6.49-50; *Nis*, 18.21-64.

[4] *Suyg* (*SBE*, Vol. XLV), 364; *Uttar*, 24.12.

[5] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol XXII), 2.1.3.6 (p. 96).

[6] Ibid, 2.1.3.9 (pp. 96f); *Dasv*, 5-1.8.

[7] Ibid, 2.1.5.2-4 (pp. 90-101); *Dasv*, 5-1.3-7.

[8] Ibid, 2.1.1.7 (p. 90).

A monk, as a rule, must beg at all houses without any distinction of the status of their inhabitants.[7] But as he intends to procure pure and admissible food, he may visit only noble families.[8] In case of special vows as regards food donor or time, he may also disobey the rules of begging and beg in peculiar ways.[9]

Normally, a monk accepts whatever he is offered to in begging. But the use of bulbs (*kanda*); roots (*mūla*); fruits, green vegetables, sprouts and blossoms of trees; juice of raw fruits, raw rice, honey, liquor, ghee, curds, molasses and oil, etc.; food specially prepared for monks (*uddesiyapiṇḍa*); food offered by the owner of the house occupied by the monks (*sajjāyarapiṇḍa*); royal food (*rāyapiṇḍa*); food from a festival (*saṁkhaḍi*) and food dripping with ghee or oil, etc. are deemed unfit for a monk.[10]

He can, if he is in such a need, take food while on the begging-tour.[11] But normally he takes it after coming back to his lodge. First of all after his return from the begging-round, he shows the

---

1. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2 1.5.2-4 (pp. 99-101); *Dasv*, 5-1.3-16.
2. Ibid, 2.1.4.4 (p. 98).
3. Ibid, 2.1.2.5 (p.93); *Bhag*, 269, pp. 291b–292a; *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 297.
4. Ibid, 2.1.4.3 (p 98)
5. Ibid, 2.1.6.2 (p. 103); *Dasv*, 5-2.8-9.
6. *Bṛhk*, 3.22.
7. *Dasv*, 5-1 14.
8. Ibid, 5-1.10-11; 5-1.16-17.
9. *Uttar*, 30.19; *Ṭhāṇ*, 514, p. 365 b.
10. *Dasv*, 5-1. 70-75; 5-2. 14-24; 3.3; 7.57; *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2,1.1. 11-14 (pp. 90-91); 2.1.2.3 (P. 92); 2.1.3.5 (p.96); 2.1 6.8 (p. 104); 2.1.6.9 (p. 104); 2.1.7.1 (p. 105); 2.1.7.5 (p. 107); 2.1 9.1 (p. 111); 2.1.9.3 (p. 112); Vide *Infra*, 'Articles of food'.
11. *Dasv*, 5-1. 82-83.

contents of his bowl to the *gurū* and performs the *pratikramaṇa* for the transgressions committed intentionally or inadvertently in course of begging. Then he distributes it to the needy fellow-monks and takes it in their company.[1] Generally it is finished in the third *porisī* of the day[2], i.e. nine hours after sun-rise, a practice which unlike that of the Buddhists who must finish their luncheon before noon[3].

2 *Clothing and dress* : It has already been stated that the material needs of a Jaina monk are very limited. The requisites which they possess are called *bhaṇḍaga*[4] or *dhammopagaraṇa*[5], and are of two types—*ogha* or essential requisites and *aūpagrāhika* or auxiliary requisites, sometimes also interpreted as requisites of general and occasional use respectively[6]. The former group, for instance, includes clothes, begging-bowl, blanket and broom, etc.[7], while the latter stick (*daṇḍa*), leather-bag (*cammakosa)*, curtain (*cilimilī*), etc[8].

The problem of clothing was in no way less important than that of the food as it was one of the most important items of requisites which the monks were allowed to use. Moreover, it was perhaps the question of dress which was responsible for the division of the Order into two, the Digambara or the sky-clad and the Śvetāmbara or the white-clad. The Digambaras advocated and practised nudity because Lord Mahāvīra not only discarded the use of clothes completely but also recommended it to his followers—'*mae samaṇāṇaṁ...acelate dhamme paṇṇatte...*'[9]. Besides, the idea of nakedness is also attested by the epithets, *nagiṇa*[10] and *acela*[11], assigned to the Jaina monks and the inclusion of nakedness (*aceloparisaha*) in the list of *parisahas*[12].

On the other hand, there are references in the Āgamas which go against the idea of nakedness, i. e. nakedness is not deemed as a compulsory item of monastic life.[13] But it never means that those who are

---

1. Ibid, 5-1. 84-97; *Āyār (SBE.* Vol. XXII), 2.1. 10.1-3 (pp. 113 ff); *Uttar*, 1.35.
2. *Uttar*, 26. 12.
3. Vide *Infra*, 'Time of eating'.
4. *Uttar*, 24.13; *Ogh N*, 666, p. 207 b.
5. *OghN*, 745, p. 229 b.
6. *Uttar*, 24.13; *OghN*, 667, p. 208a.
7. *OghN*, 668-677, pp. 208a-209b.
8. Ibid, 728-29, pp. 217b-218a.
9. *Ṭhān*, 693, p. 460b.
10. *Dasv*, 6.65.
11. *Āyār*, 1.7.7.1.
12. *Uttar*, ii.
13. Ibid, 2.12-13; 23.32-33 ; *Āyār* (*SBE.* Vol. XXII), 1.6.3.1 (p. 57); 1.7.4.1 (p. 69); 1.7.6.1 (p. 71) ; 1.7.7.1 (p. 73); *Suyg* (*SBE.* Vol. XLV), p. 354.

allowed robes can use it profusely and without any restriction. The monks can use, in all, two robes[1], an under-garment and an upper-garment, or three robes[2], two under-garments and one upper-garment, while the nuns four[3], one under-garment and three other robes. The number of robes is in no case to be enhanced. Not only this, the stouter and the younger folks are permitted to use only one robe, while the older ones two or more.[4] The reasons for such a small number of robes allowed to the mendicants are that they use clothes not for bodily decoration and decency but for the sake of avoiding shame, disrespect from the people and to carry out the vows of *parīsaha* (*parīsahavattiyaṁ*).[5]

Besides the limitation to the number of robes, the Jaina monks were very much particular about the material, colour and the nature of clothes. Normally they preferred clothes made of cotton and wool.[6] But in case these were not available, then they could use those of silk (*bhaṁgiyaṁ*), hemp (*sāṇayaṁ*), palm-leaves (*pottayaṁ*) *arhatula*[7] and *tiriḍa*[8] bark. Under no circumstances, they could use coloured, decorated, costly and gorgeous costumes.[9] Thus they used a robe permissible to them without washing or cleaning[10] it so long as it endured.[11]

Devoted householders were the only source from whom the monks met their needs for clothes. They asked the householders only for such clothes which were most suited to them and at the same time of no use for the householders Moreover, the clothes to be accepted by the monks must also be lasting and of required length and breadth[1], because they were not allowed to use a cloth sewn together in normal circumstances[2]. It is remarkable that most of the rules as regards cloth were similar to those of food.[3]

---

[1] *Uttar*, 23.29.

[2] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 1.7.4.1 (pp. 67-69); *Bṛhk*, 3.15-16.

[3] Ibid, 2.5.1.1 (p, 157); *Ṭhān*, 246, p. 186b; *Bṛhk*, 3.16.

[4] Ibid, 2.5.1.1 (p. 157).

[5] *Ṭhān*, 171, p. 138a.

[6] Ibid, 170, p. 138a; *OghN*, 705, p. 213b.

[7] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.5.1.1 (p. 157).

[8] *Ṭhān*, 446, pp. 338ab.

[9] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.5.1-3-5 (pp. 157f).

[10] Ibid, 1.7.4.1 (p. 68); 2.5.1.17 (p 162); *Nis*, 18.21-64.

[11] This restriction is due to the avoidance of the risk of injury to life. But if adequate hot water be available and the cleansing material such as surf which are without living beings in sight, they have become permissible. Dirty clothes are rather fertile breeding-ground and shelter of vermin and so a timely washing may avoid this contingency. Very likely the compilers of the *Niryuktis* apprehending this flaw in the law allowed washing of clothes and other requisites and laid down elaborate rules as regards the same—*OghN*, 349-57, pp. 131b-138a; *PindN*, 23-34, pp. 11b-16a.

Next to cloth comes *pāya* or *pātra* (begging-bowl), also known as *bhāyaṇa*[4] and *paḍiggaha*[5]. It has already been noted that the alms-bowl of the monks should in no case be made out of metals, not even of iron (*aya*), stones (*sela*), shell (*saṁkha*), tusk (*danta*), horn (*siṁga*), cloth (*cela*) or leather (*camma*), but only of gourd (*lāu*), wood (*dāru*), or clay (*maṭṭiyā*)[6]. A pot used by the householders is also deemed unfit for the monks.[7]

Other articles which formed the group of essential requisites were *kaṁbala* (blanket), *pāyapuñchaṇa* duster) and *muhapotti* (month-covering cloth), etc. which, more or less, have been explained in the previous pages.[8]

Those worthy of mention among the auxiliary requisites were skin (*camma*), leather-bag (*cammakosa*), skin-cutter (*cammachedaka*), curtain (*cilimilī*), needle (*sui*), razor (*pippalaga*), etc.[9] These were sought from the householders and were returned to the person concerned immediately after the purpose was over. Thus the total number of requisites allowed to the Jinakalpikas, Sthavirakalpikas and the Bhikkhunis were twelve, fourteen and twenty-five respectively.[10]

Normally the use of umbrella[11], stick[12], shoes or the like was not allowed to the monks.

The various references to certain diseases and their infallible treatment go to prove that the Jaina monks were allowed to make use of medical aid from the very beginning of the Church. It was because of this that they were allowed even some forbidden articles of food and drink.[13]

---

[1] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.5.1-2 (pp. 157-65).
[2] Ibid, 2.5.1 (pp. 157-163).
[3] Ibid, 2.5.1.2 (p. 157).
[4] *Bhag*, 111, p. 139a.
[5] *Nāyā*, p 29; *Dasv*, 5-2.1.
[6] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.6.1-3 (pp. 166-67); *Dasv*, 6.51-53.
[7] *Dasv*, 6.53.
[8] Vide *Supra* 'Outfit of a Jaina monk'.
[9] *OghN*, 728-29, pp. 217b-218a.
[10] *OghN*, 668-677, pp. 208a-209a.
[11] *Vav*, 8 5.
[12] *OghN*, 730-39, pp, 218ab ; *Nis*, 5.25-33.
[13] Vide *Infra*, 'Pūtimuttabhesajja'.

Wandering life : One of the peculiar traits of the Jaina ascetics is that they lead a wandering life which is interrupted during the four months of the rains only. During the rest of the year, they stay not for more than one night in a village and five nights in a town in the minimum[1] or for one month in the maximum[2]. The Āgamas contain a series of rules which control asetics' life while they are on tour.

As the principle of no harming is the nucleus of Jaina monastic life, the regulations as regards travel are also permeated with the same principle It is therefore befitting that a monk or a nun is asked to walk carefully either on one's toes or heels or the sides of one's feet looking four cubits forward so that he or she may not incur the sin of injury to living beings.[3] So also, he or she is prescribed to choose a byroad, if there is any life on the main road.[4]

The principle of non-injury is followed by the theory of self-preservation, both moral and physical. A monk or a nun is therefore advised to set out on tour with their complete outfit so that he or she may not be inconvenienced in any way.[5] Further they are also asked not to travel either with a heretic or a householder as it may lead to moral degradation or pervertion.[6] As a road passing through border area, or infested with robbers, running through regions inhabited by *Mlecchas*, non-Aryan people, partially civilised people or undevoted persons[7], or going through a country having no king or many kings or the like[8] is fraught with all sorts of troubles and dangers—such a road is deemed unfit for the ascetics. The most suitable road or path for mendicants' walk is therefore that which is much used by carts and chariots, elephants and horses, asses and camels, and cows and buffaloes; or frequented by men and women, or scorched by the sun's heat, or that which is tilled for crop-bearing *(satthapariṇata)*.[9]

Boat travel was however allowed to the ascetics. But the use of a boat owned by the host *(sajjātarī)* or giving any kind of help in order to see the boat moving was in no case allowed to them.[10]

---

[1] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII). 2.3.1.7. (p. 137) ; *Dasā*, 7th dasā, p. 45a ; *HJM*, pp. 157, 242.

[2] *Bṛhk*, 1.6-7.

[3] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2,3.1.6 (p. 137).

[4] Ibid, 2.3.1.6-7 (p 137); 2.3.3.13 (p. 147); *Dasv*, 5. 12ff.

[5] Ibid, 2.1.3 8 (p. 96).

[6] Ibid, 2.1.1.9 (p. 90).

[7] Ibid, 2.3.1.7-9 (pp. 137-38).

[8] Ibid, 2.3.1.10 (p. 138).

[9] Ibid, 2 3 1.6 (p. 137).

[10] Ibid, 2.3.1.13-21 (pp. 139-41).

Whatever might have been the reasons, sometimes the mendicants were thrown into the river. In that case they could swim across the river leaving their requisites behind.[1]

Water travel was allowed to ascetics in unavoidable circumstances only. The ascetics, before entering into the water, wiped their bodies thoroughly and crossed it by putting one foot into the water and the other in the air and without being touched or by touching anybody else[2] Coming to the shore they did not brush their muddy feet against the grass in order to clean.[3] Five great rivers, namely, Gaṅgā, Jaūṇā, Saraū, Erāvaī and Mahī could be crossed more than twice or thrice within a month in case of calamities and dangers only.[4]

Mendicants' life during rainy season : It was during the four months of the rainy season that the ascetics confined themselves to one place by biding farewell to their itinerary habits. The practice of the Jaina monks called *vassāvāsa* or *cāturmāsa*, its English rendering being rain-retreat or simply retreat, originally began on the fifth day of the bright-half on the month of Bhādrapada (August-September) and ceased on the full-moon day of the month of Kārtika (October-November). Thus it lasted for seventy days only.[5] But later on the duration of the period was extended to complete four months, starting from the full moon day of Asāḷha (June-July) and terminating on the full-moon day of the month of Kārtika.[6] It was perhaps the difficulties arising from the scarcity of accommodation and provisions which were responsible for the curtailment of the duration from four months to seventy days because the ascetics had no liking for possession of properties or storing up food-stuff, etc. at all.[7]

In normal circumstances the ascetics do not stay in a house full of living beings[8], or in houses inhabited or frequented by householders and heretics[9], the reasons being that the former has scope for inflicting injury to living beings while the latter for moral degradation.

---

1. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.3.2.2-7 (pp. 141-42).
2. Ibid, 2 3.2.9-10 (p 143).
3. Ibid, 2.3.2.12 (p. 143).
4. *Ṭhan*, 412, p. 308b, *Nis*, 11.42.
5. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 296, *Samv*, 70, p. 81a.
6 *Nis*, 10.40.
7. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 296.
8. *Āyār* (*SBE*, Vol. XXII), 2. 2. 1. 1 (p. 120).
9. Ibid, 2. 2. 1. 8-12 & 2. 2. 2. 1-8 (pp. 122-27); *Nis*, 10. 46.

Normally they select three abodes for observing retreat,[1] all of these well-furnished with a place for answering calls of nature,[2] having enough accommodation for religious practice and having wide scope for begging alms and other requisites.[3]

The obvious reason which led them to keep retreat was that they wished to avoid injury because of the over-growth of vegetation in the season.[4] Along with it, they were relieved from the troublesome journey when most of the roads become slushy.

In normal circumstances, nobody could leave one's residence and go out even for a day or two before the expiry of the term of the retreat.[5] But in case of some urgent piece of work of the Order or of the *ācārya* or of the *upādhyāya*,[6] or in case of troubles and dangers[7], one could shift to any one of the three abodes selected for the purpose.[8]

In order to avoid injury to living beings, the monks and the nuns try to move the minimum during the retreat period. Having this end in view, they do not go more than a *yojana* and a *krosa* all around their residence for alms.[9] Sometimes, they give up food altogether so that they neither have to go for collecting alms nor for easing calls of nature.[10] Thus the Jaina saints live, of course, a severe life during the rains.

Residence of Jaina monks : As nobody was allowed to stay for more than one night in a village and five nights in a town throughout the eight months[11], the Jaina ascetics, unlike the Buddhists, had no fixed dwelling of their own. They often halted in gardens and temples[12], cemeteries, deserted houses, mountain caves and potters' workshops[13] in course of their tour. When selecting a lodging place, they had to keep two things in mind. It was that the place had neither any scope for *hiṁsā* nor for misconduct either from their side or from the householder. In this connection the *Āyāraṅga* refers to a peculiar idea. It states that the ladies of the houses, thinking to have a promising child from a celibate monk, might enforce the ascetics to have sexual intercourse.[1] As such a house occupied by householders[2], a place frequented by women, beasts, eunuchs[3] and heretics[4], containing cobwebs and eggs[5], etc was deemed unfit for the mendicants. Similar was the case with a lodging prepared puposely for the ascetics.[6]

---

[1] *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 310.
[2] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 2. 3. 24 (p. 134).
[3] Ibid, 2. 3. 1. 3 (pp. 136-37).
[4] Ibid, 2. 3. 1. 1. (p. 136).
[5] *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 310.
[6] Ibid.
[7] *Ṭhān*, 413, p. 308 b.
[8] *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 310.
[9] Ibid, p. 297, also p. 310.
[10] Ibid, p. 297.
[11] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.3.1.6 (p. 137); *Aup*, p. 17; *Mūl*, 9. 19, *HJM* pp. 157, 242.
[12] *Vivagasuya*, p. 17; *Uttar*, 9. 4; 18.4; 23.4-8; *Nāyā*, p. 69.
[13] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 1.7.2.1 (p. 64).

Before occupying a suitable abode, the formal permission of the lawful owner of the house was necessary.[7]

The Church units and the hierarchy of officers : The Jainas managed the Church affairs very wisely. At the very outset, they divided the Order into various units and placed them under the direct control of seniors so that the law and the order might not be at stake. The most ancient unit and perhaps the biggest too was *gaṇa*[8] which later on was superseded by *gaccha*[9]. A *gaṇa* comprised several *saṁbhogas.*[10] Not even the *Chedasūtras* and the *Niryuktis*, much less the *Aṅgas* and the *Mūlasūtras* contain any information as regards the number of monks a *saṁbhoga* consisted of. But the exact number of monks which a *gaṇa* comprised varied from three to several thousands.[11] On this evidence we may infer that the minimum number of monks which might have formed a *saṁbhoga* was three. Changing one's *gaṇa*[12] within an interval of six months was regarded as *sabala* ,i.e., a grave offence.[13]

---

[1] *Op. cit*, (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 2. 1. 12 (p. 124).

[2] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol XXII), 2. 2. 2. 6 (p. 126); 2. 2. 3. 5-11 (pp. 131-132).

[3] *Nāyā*, p. 76, *Bhag*, p. 758 b.

[4] *Āyār* (*SBE*. V l. XXII), 2. 2. 2. 8-13 (pp. 126-128).

[5] Ibid, 2. 2. 1. 1 (p. 120); 2. 2. 2. 5 (p. 126).

[6] Ibid, 2. 2. 3. 14 (pp. 128-29).

[7] Ibid, 2. 7. 2. 1 (pp. 173-74).

[8] *Ṭhān*, 475, p. 352b; 693, p. 460 b; *Bhag*, 211, p. 231b; *Samv*, 8, p. 13b; 37, p. 65a; 48, p.70a; 56, p. 73b; 62, p. 75b; 66, p.78b; 83, p. 89b; 86, p. 92b; 90, p.94b: 93, p.97 a; 95, p.97b; 143, p.129a; *Angd*, 7.56; *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol· XXII), 2. 1. 10. 1 (p. 113); *Uttar*, 17. 17. refers to the expression *gaṇaṁgaṇiya* which according to the commentators, means one who attaches himself to another *gaṇa* every half year.–Vide *SBE*. Vol. XLV, p. 79, fn 2.

[9] Comm. to *Ṭhān*, pp. 241b, 331b, 340a, 353a, 381a, 386a, etc. Comm. to *Ogh*N, p, 211a.

[10] *Bṛhk*, 4. 18-20.

[11] *Mūl*, 10. 92, *BṛhkB*. Vol. II, 1443.

[12] *Ṭhān*, 541, p. 381a gives seven reasons for changing one's *gaṇa*.

[13] *Dasā*, 2nd *dasā*.

The *gaccha*, like the *gaṇa*[1], which is sometimes taken as a batch of monks having common reading (course of study), is called *gurū-parivāra*, the following of a particular *ācārya*.[2] The information as regards the number of monks consisting a *gaccha* which was three[3] or seven[4] seems to be incomplete. The head of a *gaccha* is called *gaṇin*,[5] *ācaraya*[6] or *sūri*.[7]

Besides these, we are told of units like *kula*[8], *saṁbhoga*,[9] *sākhā*[10], *maṇḍalī*[11], etc, which were smaller in size than the *gaṇa* or the *gaccha* and were formed from time to time according to the need of the Order.

Unlike the Buddhists, the Jainas preferred autocratic form of government for their Order. They appointed a number of officers who either trained novices or governed the group just referred to. In the life-time of Lord Mahāvīra, the office of *gaṇadhara* was, no doubt, the highest distinction conferred on a professed monk. The eleven *gaṇadharas* appointed by the Lord himself were taken indeed, and are taken even nowadays in very high esteem only next to the Lord himself.[12]

Later on they envisaged a number of offices, worthy of mention among which were those of *ācārya*, *upādhyāya*, *ācāryopādhyāya*. *gaṇin*, *gaṇāvacchedaka*, *pravartinī*, etc.

The *ācārya* was decidedly the highest authority as most of the businesses, personal or ecclesiastical, were to be performed with his consent or permission.[13] In addition to his duties to initiate and train novices[1], he also managed for the lodging place and the material needs of the Order[2]. According to one of the *Aṅgas* he was the only male officer who had to take care of the Order of nuns[3]. It was therefore natural that only a person of high moral character having the knowledge of the *Sthānāṅga* and the *Samavāyāṅga Sūtras*, and at least of eight years standing in monkhood was appointed to this post.[4]

---

[1] A *gaṇa* comprised of three *kulas*. Comm. to *Bhag*, p. 382b.

[2] *Pañcavastukagrantha* as quoted in *Pāiasaddamahaṇṇavo*, p. 358; *Aup*, p. 86.

[3] *BṛhkB*, Vol. II, 1630.

[4] Comm. to *Mūl*, I, p. 133.

[5] *ĀvasN*, pp.353ab.

[6] *Aup*, p. 125.

[7] *Gacchācāra*, 8.

[8] Comm. to *Aup* p. 81; *Vav*, 10.34; Comm. to *Uttar*, p. 168b; Comm. to *Ṭhān*, p. 516a; Comm. to *Bhag*, p. 382b.

[9] *Āyār*, II. 66.12; II. 106.20-24; *Ṭhān*, 173, p. 139a; 398, p. 300a; 662, p. 444a; *Samv*, 12, p. 21b; *Uttar*, 29.33; *Aup*, p. 74; *Vav*, 7.1;5.19, *Nis*, 5.63.

[10] *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), pp. 286-295; Jacobi's remark–Ibid, p. 288, fn2.

[11] *OghN*, 553, p. 183b; 561, p. 18[illegible]a.

[12] *Samv*, 11, p. 19a; *Ṭhān*, 177, p.142b; *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.1.10.1 (p. 113).

[13] *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), pp. 297, 306-307; *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.1.10.1 (p. 113); *OghN*, 9, p. 22b.

The *Aṅgas* and the *Mūlasūtras* ascribe an inferior position to *upādhyāya*[5] compared with that of the *Chedasūtras*[6] which count him as one of the three protectors of nuns. As the only duty of the *upādhyāya* was to teach novices, a monk at least of three years standing having a sound knowledge of the scriptures along with their exposition was to be posted to this office [7]

From the qualifications and experience of the *ācāryopādhyāya* it is evident that he was an officer holding a position higher than the *upādhyāya* and lower than the *ācārya*[8], and accordingly he looked after the duties of the *ācārya* or of the *upādhyāya* when either of them was absent or busy with some other works[9]. The *gaṇin* was an officer of the same rank as the *gaṇadhara*.[10] No specific mention about the exact position of the *gaṇāvacchedaka*[11] and the *pravartinī*[12] has been made in any of the texts. In all probability, the *pravartinī* enjoyed the same position in the Order of nuns as the *ācārya* in the Order of monks

The Jaina Order of nuns : Now it is most opportune to make a brief reference to the Jaina Order of nuns. According to the Śvetāmbara tradition, the Order of nuns is an old as the prehistoric first Tīrthaṅkara Ṛsabha whose following comprised, the Jainas believe, 300000 nuns[13], even several times greater than that of Mahāvīra which

---

1. *Ṭhān*, 320, pp 239b-240a refers to four types of *ācāryas; Vav*, 10.11-12 refers to eight types of *ācāryas*.
2. Ibid, 544, p. 385b.
3. *Bhag*, 339, p. 382a.
4. *Vav*, 3.7.
5. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.1.10.1 (p. 113); 2.3.3.4 (p. 146); *Bhag*, 339, p. 382a; tatrācāryaḥ arthavyākhyātā, upādhyāyaḥ sūtradātā.–Comm. to *Bhag*, p. 382b.
6. *Vav*, 3. 12.
7. Ibid, 3.3-4; 10.21,
8. Ibid, 3.5; 10.20.
9. Vide *HJM*, p. 220.
10. *Dasā*, 4th *dasā;* Comm. to *Ṭhān*, p. 140a; *HJM*, pp. 148, 225.
11. *Vav*, 3 7.
12. *Bhag*, 334, pp. 375ab; *Bṛhk*, 1.41; *Vav*, 5.1.
13. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII) pp. 211-12.

included 36000 nuns only[1]. The following of Ariṣṭanemi, the twenty-second Tīrthaṅkara had 40000 nuns[2] and that of Pārśva, the twenty-third Tīrthaṅkara 38000[3]. In spite of such a great antiquity assigned to the Jaina Order of nuns by the *Aṅgas* and the *Mūlasūtras*, it may be noted that they do not contain much details as regards the same. Normally whatever is laid down for the monks is, except with some necessary adjustments, applicable in case of nuns as well. Hence they do not deserve a special reference. What is worthy of our notice is that the Jainas, in consonance with the other contemporary sects, subordinated nuns to monks.[4]

Mutual relation beetween the monks and the nuns : Like others, the Jaina Order seems to have taken a very strict attitude as regards monks relation with nuns and *vice versa.* Monks and nuns are not allowed to stand together even in case of rain, if the place is lonely.[5] So also, they are not permitted to stay together in normal circustances. But the same is permissible to them in case of calamity and non-availability of proper residence.[6]

A monk, as a rule, was disallowed to speak with a nun or *vice versa.*[7] But a nun was allowed to go to the monks' monstery for the sake of study. Giving instructions to a single nun by a single monk in a lonely place was strictly forbidden.[8] No nun was permitted to impart instruction to a monk, old or young at night.[9] A monk, under unavoidable circumstances, was allowed to pay a visit to the nunnery, but that too was to be done with the permission of the teacher and in a proper manner. Harassing a nun by keeping a stick, a broom or any other thing in her way was requited with appropriate punishment.[10]

Mutual service between the members of their respective orders is a compulsory item of monastic life. But waiting upon an ill monk by a nun or *vice versa* is not permitted.[11] Not only exchange of food

---

1. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 157.
2. *Samv*, 40, p. 66a; *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 278.
3. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 168.
4. Vide *Infra*, 'Formation of the Order of nuns'.
5. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 303.
6. *Ṭhān*, 417, p. 314a.
7. *Gacchācāra*, 62, 109.
8. Ibid, 94.
9. Ibid, 116.
10. *Nis*, 4.24.
11. In case of serious illness, etc. a *gaṇadhara*, etc. could visit a nunnery. *BṛhkB*, Vol. IV, 3755-3801.

between a monk and a nun is disallowed[1], but accepting any medicine, howmuch beneficial and rare it may be, from a nun is also prohibited.[2]

Any sort of physical contact between the monks and the nuns, as a rule, is not allowed. But the same is permissible in cases of dangers and difficulties. As such a monk must help a nun in case of an attack by a wild animal or bird, in order to save her from bad surroundings or to take her out of mud or water, at the time of getting into or coming out of a boat, if her mind is unhinged or in similar other cases.[3] It is due to this strictness of the rules of behaviour that we come across Jaina nuns even nowadays.

Attitude towards heretics : Whatever might have been the reason, a survey of regulations in point would show that the Jaina monks were repeatedly warned to have no connection with heretics.

A place inhabited or frequented by heretics was deemed unfit for the Jaina monks to live in and they were not allowed to stay with heretics even in the rainy season.[4] Besides, they were neither permitted to go on begging-tour in the company of heretics[5] nor to exchange food[6] or requisites[7] with them.

Along with others, getting heretics' service in any form was not allowed to monks and nuns. Thus allowing the heretics to carry one's requisites[8], or to massage oneself[9], or to prepare a foot-path (*padamagga*), a bridge (*saṁkama*), etc.[10] was against the rule of monastic conduct. Likewise learning from or teaching the heretics any of the sciences like the science of omens, astrology, etc. was disallowed.[11]

Thus the attitude of the Jaina monks towards mendicants belonging to other faith whom they often called *aṇṇautthiya*, was on the whole not wholesome and good.

Monks' relation with laymen : Monks' relation with laymen does not seem to be relaxed in the least even though the monks were

---

1. *Gacchācāra*, 61, 90.
2. Ibid, 92.
3. *Ṭhāṇ*, 437, p. 327 b; 475-76, p. 352 a; *Bṛhk*, 6. 7-12.
4. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.2.2.11-13 (pp. 127-28).
5 Ibid, 2.1.1.9 (p 90).
6. Ibid, 2.1.1.10 (p. 90); *Nis*, 3.1-2; 15. 75-78; 16. 36-37; 12.41.
7. *Nis*, 1.40; 12.40; 15.79-98.
8. *Nis*, 12.40.
9. Ibid, 15. 13-65.
10. Ibid, 1.11-18.
11. Ibid, 13.12-29.

always conscious of the significant position of lay-adherents whose food and drink supported them. Thus they were not allowed to accommodate a householder, known or unknown, in their monastery even for a night or a half.[1] Further they were not permitted to use pots or clothes used by the householders.[2] Doing any service to a householder; greeting, saluting or worshiping him[3]; or making diagnosis or treating a sick householder[4], too, was not permissible to a monk. Indulging in talks with a householder about astrology, dream, hypnotism, omens, incantations or medicine was strictly prohibited.[5]

Despite these facts, they were always conscious of the fact that their dealings with the householders should be such that it might not prick the sense of their prestige Naturally calling a squint 'a squint' or a thief 'a thief', or the like was deemed unbeseeming to a monk.[6] A monk should neither address a man or a woman, as the case might be, in disparaging words like fool, wretch, bitch or whore; nor in appreciating terms like master or mistress. One should always call a householder by his or her name or family-name, not in enticing terms of worldly relations like mummy, dady, sister or brother.[7]

The tenets so far perused are all expedient to the noblest principles of the Jaina faith, *viz. ahiṁsā, saṁyama* and *tapa*, the three constituents of a good religion. Now let us examine the threefold principle

(b) Ahiṁsā, the principle of non-injury

"About 500 B.C.", remarks Prof. Edward Conze, "two religions came to the fore in India which place 'No Harming' into the very centre of their doctrine—the one being Jainism and the other Buddhism[8]". But the former, we must confess, surpassed the latter as the principle of non-injury is developed to an uncomparable height in the Jaina scriptures. The earth is said to be infested with living organisms of various magnitudes, which were classified in six groups (*chajjīvaṇiyā*).[9] The first five groups of living beings possessed of one sense-organ are the earth-bodies (*puḍhavīkāiyā*), such as earth, stone,

---

1. *Nis*, 8.12.
2. *Dasv*, 6.53; *Suyg* (*SBE*. Vol. XLV), p. 304.
3. *Dasv*, *Cūliyā*, 2.9.
4. *Nis*, 12 10-13.
5. *Dasv*, 8.51.
6. Ibid, 7.12-13.
7. Ibid, 7.12-20.
8. *Buddhism*, p. 61.
9. *Dasv*, 4 1 (pp. 4-5); *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.15 (p. 202); 1.1.1-7 (pp. 1-14).

minerals, etc.; water-bodies (*āukāiyā*), such as, water, snow, mist, etc.; fire-bodies (*teukāiyā*), such as, flames, sparks, etc.; wind-bodies (*vāukāiyā*), such as, air, storm, etc.; and plant-bodies (*vaṇassaīkāiyā*), such as, leaves, stems, flowers, etc. These five fall under *sthāvarakāya* (immobile beings). Under the *trasakāya* (mobile beings) fall beings possessed of two, three, four and five sense-organs. Among the five sensed-beings, those having developed minds are comprised by hell, human and heavenly beings as well as animals with developed minds, and only animals fall under beings possessed of two, three, four and five sense-organs with undeveloped minds. The same text further refers to eight types of subtle living organisms, *viz.* subtle water-life, subtle-flower-life, subtle germ-life, subtle insect-life, subtle moss-life, subtle plant-life and subtle egg-life.[1] To sum up each and every inch of the universe is infested with living beings.

All living beings, however great or small they may be, earnestly desire to live and never to die.[2] No harm therefore should be caused to them either by mind or by word or by deed in any of the three ways, that is to say, by himself, by others or by consenting to others doing so.[3] This is the first great vow *(mahavvaya)* not of the Jainas alone, but of the Brahmins and of the Buddhists as well. This vow can be accomplished to the fullest extent only if one regards all living beings as one's own self.[4]

The Jaina monks seem to have taken utmost care in order to keep the principle of non-injury fully. Not only the rules as regards the significant aspects of day-to-day life are guided by this principle but even the precepts concerning negligible features of monk life, too, are regulated by the same principle. For instance, examining and cleaning one's requisites (*paḍilehaṇa*),[5] using boiled water,[6] scanning the places of easing nature,[7] abstinence from fire activities,[8] etc.—all these are prescribed with the same end in view.

---

1. siṇehaṁ pupphasuhumaṁ ca pāṇuttiṁgaṁ taheva ya/
   paṇagaṁ bīyaṁ hariyaṁ ca aṁḍasuhumaṁ ca aṭṭhamaṁ//–*Dasv*, 8. 15; Vide also *Kapp* (*SBE* Vol. XXII), pp. 304-306.
2. Ibid, 6.11; *Āyār* (*SBE* Vol. XXII), 1.2.3.4. (p. 19).
3. Ibid, 4.1 (p. 5); 6.27-46.
4. Ibid, 4.9.
5. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.5.1.14-15 (p. 161); *Uttar*, 26.20-31; *Ṭhān*, 503, p. 361b; *OghN*, 269-70, p. 111ab.
6. *Kapp* (*SBE*.Vol. XXII), p, 300.
7. Ibid, p. 308; *Uttar*, 24.15-18; *Suyg* (*SBE*. Vol. XLV), p. 364.
8. *Dasv*, 4.9 (p. 8).

The Jaina Church, in its effort to follow *ahiṁsā* minutely, developed most of the rules to such a height that some of them appear to be superfluous and negligible, while others disgusting and impracticable for ordinary people. The instructions to be followed in case of earth-bodies so that the monks may not run the risk of inflicting injuries to earth-bodies, may be cited as an instance in point.

"The monk or the nun, who is self-restrained, who is devoted to penance and who has renounced sinful acts, sould never by day or by night, alone or in an assembly of monks, asleep or awake, scratch or dig, shake or break, by hand or by foot, by stick or by blade, by pencil or by a bundle of pencils, (any piece of) earth or wall, stone or clod, dusty body or dusty garment; he should not make another scratch, dig, shake or break (any of the above) nor he should consent to another when he is scratching, digging, shaking or breaking, etc. (He should say :) as long as I am alive, I would not give trouble to living beings by mind, by word or by action in any of the three ways, *viz.* by himself, by others or by consenting others giving the trouble and I abandon and depricate such inclination on the part of my soul."[1]

But as a matter of fact, the truth is otherwise. Each and every precept in this respect, when analysed reveals that it has been set forth after a good deal of experiment, and hence is not altogether uncommon in day-to-day life. A reference to an interesting story about the evil consequences due to carelessness in offering food to a monk will illustrate the case clearly.

A certain Jaina monk, called Dharmaghoṣa, while on the begging round stopped at the house of the minister Vārttaka. The minister's wife came out with ghee, sugar and soup for the monk. But while she was coming, a drop of soup fell down on the ground, seeing which the monk did not accept the alms. The minister who was watching the scene from a distance could not understand the reason of the monk's return. He, therefore, decided to remain at a distance and watch further.

Now, it so happened, that flies settled upon the drop of sweet soup. Seeing the flies, spiders came there to eat the flies. To devour the spiders, a chameleon rushed in. A cat attacked the chameleon, and a dog seize the cat. Other dogs fell upon the dog and it led finally to the fight between the owners of the dogs.[2]

---

[1] *Dasv*, 4. 7. (p. 7). The same type of instructions are issued in case of the remaining five groups-Vide Ibid. 4. 8-12 (pp. 7-9).

[2] Quoted from *HJM*, p. 301; *Vṛtti* to *PindN*, 627-28, pp. 168a-170b.

It is really very difficult to foresee the disastrous consequences which may come out of such a negligible mistake commited by a person while offering food to a monk or the like. Thanks to the foresight and carefulness of the Jaina monks who tried to evade injury to others even by risking their personal ease and comfort.

It has already been remarked that the precepts discussed in the previous pages help in keeping the vow of non-killing. Besides, the five *samitis* or restraint over the five modes of the body is, no doubt, of immense use in this respect. If a monk is careful in walking (*iriyā*), in speech (*bhāṣā*), in receiving alms (*eṣaṇā*), in receiving and keeping requisites (*ādānanikṣepaṇa*) and in the disposition of bodily excreta (*uccārapraśravaṇa*), he cannot run the risk of breaking the vow of non-killing.[1] Appropriate instructions are issued in this respect. For instance he is not allowed to walk by unused roads in which the presence of any insect is difficult to find out,[2] to speak harsh and unkind words which may lead to quarrels and disputes,[3] to disobey any of the forty-two rules of begging alms,[4] to receive and keep any of the requisites without making it free from living beings[5] and to deposit bodily excreta at a place full of living beings[6].

(c) Saṁyama or self-restraint

The precepts as regards *saṁyama* may conveniently be taken up under three sub-headings, *viz*. precepts regarding (i) moral life of the Jaina monks, (ii) abstinence from bodily decoration and (iii) perfect self-control.

i. *Moral life of the Jaina monks* : The Jaina monks, like other Indian mendicants, were admonished to observe a sublime moral discipline. The worst thing that was feared to corrupt them was sex. It was only because of this that the Jaina Order framed unsparing rules as regards monks' relation with women.

We are told that a woman is as dangerous to a celibate monk as a cat is to a chicken. A monk, therefore, with a view to avoid this

---

1. *Uttar*, 24. 1-18.
2. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 3. 1. 6 (p. 137).
3. Ibid, 2. 4 1-2 (pp 149-155); *Dasv*, 7th Chap.; *Ṭhāṇ*, 569, p. 403b.
4. *Vide Infra*, 'Piṇḍiyālcpabhojana'; *Supra*, pp. 17-19.
5. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 5. 1. 14-15 (p. 161); 2. 6. 1. 11 (pp. 168-69); *Uttar*, 24. 14.
6. *Uttar*, 24. 15-18; *Suyg* (*SBE*. Vol. XLV), p. 364; *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 308.

danger, must not gaze even at the paintings or forms of women. If he happens to see them, he should withdraw his face from them as from the sun. He should, in fact, avoid even disfigured and old woman.[1] Not only that, he should not use beds and seats used by women, eunuchs, etc.; tell stories to women in loneliness; contemplate over women; enjoy a common seat with a woman; take interest in singing, laughing or any other activity of women even from behind a curtain; or recall past pleasures to mind.[2] Furthermore he should not use a place occupied by householders even for religious purposes[3], except in cases of emergency[4], for it is not unlikely that he may also be forced by women of the house for sexual intercourse[5]. In brief a monk should have no connection with women.[6]

If despite every precaution, a monk fell in with a woman who forced him to have sexual intercourse, then he should keep her on the right path by preaching religious sermons. If he could not succeed in it, then he should endeavour to get rid of her by assuring to come back after disrobing himself or by threatening to self-immolation. In any circumstances, he must not surrender to her desires.[7]

Besides actual sex experience by intercourse or masturbation, a monk was strictly forbidden to use any direct or indirect method of sexual enjoyment.[8]

ii. *No bodily decoration* : Normally monks were not expected to seduce woman. Nevertheless, the Order seems to have taken the minutest precaution in order to avoid any ugly instance of the kind. Bodily charm, as it is considered one of the unfailing means to entice a woman, the monks were asked to neglect their bodies completely. Not only external purification[9] like washing the body or garments, teeth-cleansing, nail-cutting, hair-cutting, etc. were disal-

---

1. *Dasv*, 8.54-56.
2. *Ṭhān*, 663, pp. 444ab.
3. *Āyār* (*SBE*.Vol.XXII), 2.2.1.8-12 (pp.122-24); *Suyg* (*SBE*. Vol. XLV), p 275.
4. Under five circumstances a monk can enter into the royal palace –*Ṭhān*, 415, pp. 311b-312a.
5. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 1.5.4.4-5 (pp. 48-49).
6 A superstition was ripe in India that a son produced by a monk would develop extra-ordinary abilities, physical, intellectual and moral. Several criminal cases were instituted in law courts against this practice.
7. *OghN*, 421, p. 153a.
8. *Vav*, 6.8-9; *Nis*, 1.1-9; 6.19-77; 7.79-91; *Bṛhk*, 5.1-4; *Dasā*, 2nd *dasā*.
9. veejja nijjarāpehī, āriyaṁ dhammaṇuttaraṁ /
jāva sarīrabheutti, jallaṁ kāeṇa dhārae // *Uttar*, 2. 37.

lowed to them[4], but the use of any thing as an aid to the beauty and charm of the body was strictly prohibited to them as well. Consequently, complete, new and coloured robes[5]; garlands and ornaments[6]; costly and decorated garments[7]; and mirror, oil and powder[8] were in no case allowed to them.

The most repulsive and troublesome thing which they practised to mar their appearance was uprooting of hair (*loya*) which, according to the *Samavāyāṅgasūtra*, was done at an interval of two, three or four months.[1] The Sthavirakalpikas did it chiefly in the rainy season[2], while the Jinakalpikas in all seasons (*dhuvaloo*)[3].

iii *Perfect self-control* : In addition to the restraints as regards moral life and bodily negligence, the monks had to develop some positive virtues as well. In this connection the five *mahāvratas*, the five *samitis*, the three *guptis* and the ten *yati-dharmas* deserve special attention.

The *mahāvratas* formed the very basis of monk life. They consisted in abstaining from inflicting injury to living beings even in its slightest form (*savvāö pāṇāivāyāo veramaṇa*); avoiding lies of all types but that which might not lead to disastrous consequences (*savvāo musāvāyāo veramaṇa*); giving up stealing, appropriating or using anything that had not been given or allowed to use by the lawful proprietor (*savvāo adinnādānāo veramaṇa*); not indulging in sexual intercourse even of the slightest form like the touch of an animal of the opposite sex (*savvāo mehuṇāo veramaṇa*) and renunciating all possession and attachment, either little or much, small or great (*savvāo pariggahāo veramaṇa*).[4]

The five *samitis* were those which regulated the movement (*iriyā*), speech (*bhāsā*), begging (*esaṇā*), receiving and keeping the requisites

---

1. *Dasv*, 3.'-3, 3.61-64, 6.61-67; *Samv*, 18, p. 35b; *Ṭhān*, 693, p. 460b; *Suyg (SBE.* Vol. XLV), pp. 302-303, 380, etc; *Uttar*, 2.37; *Āyār* (SBE. Vol. XXII), 2.13.1-23 (pp. 266-68).
2. *Āyār (SBE.* Vol. XXII), 1.7.4.1 (p 68); *Nis*, 6.19-23.
3. *Nis*, 7.1-12.
4. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol XXII),2.5.1.4-5 (p. 158);2.5.1.10-12 (p.160);2.5.1.17 (p. 162).
5. Ibid, 2.2.1.8 (p. 122); *Nis*, 3.16-67; 13.31-41.
6. *Op. cit.*, 57.
7. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 308; *Nis*, 10.44; *NisB*, 3210-3214.
8. *DasaN*, 85, p. 58b; *Nis*, 10.44; *NisB*, 3210-3214.
9. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.15 (pp. 202-210); *Ṭhān*, 389, p. 290a; *Antg*, p. 36; Besides these five, the *Dasv*, 4. 1-6 (pp. 5-7) adds abstinence from night-meal as the sixth *mahāvrata*. The *Samv*. 5, p.10a calls the *mahāvratas* as *nijjaraṭṭhāṇa*.

(*āyāṇabhaṇḍanikkhevaṇa*) and the disposition of bodily excreta (*uccārapāsavaṇakhelasiṅghāṇajallapariṭṭhāvaṇa*).[1]

The three *guptis* were those which exercised a control over the mind (*mana*), speech (*vāk*) and body (*kāya*)[2].

The practice of the *samitis* controls only the body, whereas that of the *guptis* both mind and body.

The ten *yatidharmas* consisted in the cultivation of forgiveness (*khanti*), non-attachment (*mutti*), non-deceit (*ajjava*), modesty (*maddava*), carefulness (*lāghava*), truthfulness (*sacca*), self-restraint (*saṁjama*) ,penance (*tava*), non-possession (*ciyāya*), and celibacy (*bambhacera*)[3].

(d) Tapa or self-mortification and penance

Besides the steps which the Nigaṇṭhas took to lead a sublime moral life, to make themselves ugly and loathsome and to cultivate some special virtues, they also persisted in self-mortification and penance of various descriptions. Even Lord Mahāvīra, the last in the list of the twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras is also referred to have "neglected his body and abandoned the care of it; he with equanimity bore, underwent and suffered all pleasant or unpleasant occurences arising from divine powers, men or animal" for more than a period of twelve years[4].

The types of penance and self-mortification which the monks usually carried on consisted chiefly of twenty-two *parīsahas*, twelve types of *tapas* and the twelve *bhikṣu-pratimas* which would be examined seriatim.

i. *Twenty-two parīsahas* : The twenty-two *parīsahas* were the troubles due to hunger (*digañchā*), thirst (*pivāsā*), cold (*sīya*), heat (*usiṇa*), mosquitoes and insects (*daṁsamasaga*), nakedness (*acela*), despondency (*arati*), women (*itthī*), constant wandering (*cariyā*), unsuitable place of study and meditation (*nisīhiyā*), uncomfortable lodging (*sejjā*), scold and abuse (*akkosa*), ill-treatment (*vaha*), feeling shame in begging (*jāyaṇā*), fruitless begging (*alābha*), sickness (*roga*), pricking of grass (*taṇaphāsa*), bodily dirt (*jalla*), good as well as bad treatment (*sakkārapurakkhāra*), knowledge and reason (*paṇṇā*), ignorance (*annāṇa*) and right attitude to own religious truth (*daṁsaṇa*), which the monks usually put up with.[5]

---

1. *Samv*, 5, p. 10a; *Ṭhān*, 457, p. 343a; *Uttar*, 20.40; 24.1-2; *Vivāgasuyaṁ*, pp 15, 8 ; *Antg*, p. 17; *Suyg* (*SBE*. Vol. XIV), p. 364; *Bhag*, 92, p. 121a; *Aup*, 17.
2. Ibid, 3, p 8a, *Ṭhān*, 126, p 111b; *Aup*, 17.
3. Ibid, 10, p. 16b.
4. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 260.
5. *Uttar*, ii; *Samv*, 22, p. 40b; *Bhag*, 8. 8. 343, pp. 388b–389b,

ii. *Twelve tapas* : The twelve types of austerities are grouped under two headings called external (*bāhira*) and internal (*abhintara)* austerities.[1] The external austerities six in number are as follows[2] :

Aṇasaṇa, that is complete abstinence from all kinds of food for a period fixed by the individual concerned is either taken temporarily (*itvara*) or till one's death *(saṁlekhaṇa)* The temporary fasting varied from fasts upto the fourth meal *cauttha*, i e. one day's fast to fast for six months.[3](1)

Ūṇoyariyā, the vow of eating less than one's fill consists in abjuring all sorts of spicy food and also taking food more than thirty-two morsels each of the size of the hen's egg.[4](2)

Bhikkhāyariyā is the vow of begging food with some self-imposed restrictions and limitations as regards the mode of begging, the nature of donor and food or the like [5] (3)

Rasapariccāga is the practice of abstaining from dainty food like meat, butter, honey and alcohol (the so-called 'great *vikṛtis*') completely and milk, curds, ghee, oil, molasses and certain fried things optionally.[6](4)

Kāyakilesa or mortification of the body consists in standing, sitting or lying for a certain period in one or the other of the various bodily postures.[7] (5)

Saṁlīnayā is to retreat one's senses from all sorts of impure temptations by living in a place devoid of woman, eunuchs or animals of the opposite sex[8]. (6)

The six internal austerities are as below[9] :

Pāyacchitta[10], that is atonement for transgressions was tenfold, namely, *āloyaṇā*, *paḍikkamaṇa*, *tadubhaya*, *vivega*, *viusagga*, *tava*, *cheya*, *mūla*, *aṇavaṭṭhappā* and *pārañciya*. (1)

Vinaya, that is appropriate behaviour with reference to study, fellow-monks and one's *gurū*, etc. (2)

---

1. *Uttar*, 28. 34; 30.7; *Aup*, 18.
2. Ibid, 30. 8; *Ṭhān*, 511, p. 364b; *Aup*, 19.
3. Ibid, 30. 9–13; *Suyg (SBE*. Vol. XLV), p. 379.
4. Ibid, 30.14-24.
5. Ibid, 30.25.
6. Ibid, 30.26.
7. Ibid, 30.27; *Ṭhān*, 554, p. 397b; *Suyg* (*SBE*. Vol. XLV), pp. 251.397; *Dasv*, 3.12.
8. Ibid, 30.28.
9. Ibid, 30.30-36, *Ṭhān*, 511, p. 364b, *Aup*, 20,
10. Vide *Infra*, Chap. IV. Sec.III.

Veāvacca, that is unselfish service to superiors like *āyariya*, *uvajjhāya*, *thera*, sick fellow-monks or *gilāna*, *kula gaṇa*, *saṅgha*, etc. (3).

Sajjhāya or study consisted of teaching, learning, discussing and preaching religious tenets, etc. (4)

Jhāna, that is meditation. (5)

Viusagga or indifference to body consisted of giving up food, association with fellow-monks, passions and taking the vow of *saṁlekhaṇa*. (6)

iii. *The pratimas* : "The *pratimas* were long-term practices of bodily mortification which were based on fasting, meditation and bodily postures"[1]. The ten *pratimas* were as below[2]:

Bhaddā, that is practising *kāyotsarga* for two days and two nights facing each of the four directions for four *praharas*. (1)

Subhaddā is not clearly explained by the commentator. (2)

Mahābhaddā, that is practising *kāyotsarga* for four days and four nights facing each of the four directions for a day and a night. (3)

Savvaobhaddā, that is practising *kāyotsarga* for ten days and ten nights facing each of the ten directions for a day and a night. (4)

Bhadduttarā, like *subhaddā*, is also not clearly explained by the commentator. (5)

Javamajjhā and *vairamajjhā* together known as *candapaḍimā* were based on the number of morsel of food taken according to the increasing or decreasing digits of the moon. The former was started on the first day of the bright fortnight with only one morsel of food which was increased in accordance with the increasing of the digits of the moon. Thus it was completed with fifteen morsels of food on the full-moon day. In the same way the latter was begun on the first day of the dark fortnight with fifteen morsels of food and was finished on the new-moon day only with one morsel of food. (6-7)

Moyapaḍimā or the vow pertaining to bodily excreta or dirt (*pāsavaṇavisayā*) was either *khuḍḍiyā* (lesser) or *mahalliyā* (greater). This *pratimā* was based mainly on fast which varied from fourteenth meal to eighteenth meal.(8)

---

[1] *HJM*. p. 190.

[2] *Ṭhān*, 84, p. 64b; 251, p. 19[illegible]a; 392, p. 292a; 545, p. 385b; 687, p. 453a; 770, p. 518b; 182, p. 147b; 191, p. 157a; 237, p. 183b, Comm. to *Ṭhān*, pp. 65b, 293ab; *Samv*. 12, p. 21b; *Nāyā*, p. 42; *Dasā*, 6th *dasā*; *Bhag*, 2.1.93, pp. 123ab; *Anp*, 15.

The twelve *bhikkhupaḍimās*[1], namely, *māsiyā*, *domāsiyā*, *timāsiyā*, *caumāsiyā*, *pañcamāsiyā*, *sattamāsiyā*, *paḍhamā sattarāindiyā*, *doccā sattarāindiyā*, *taccā sattarāindiyā*, *ahorāiyā* and *egarāiyā*; and the four other *paḍimās*, *viz.* *sattasattamiā*, *aṭṭhaṭṭhamiyā*, *navanavamiyā* and *dasadasamiyā*, all of these were based mainly either on fasting or on the quantity of food and drink consumed by the practitioner. (9-10)

The main difference between the *parīsahas* on the one hand, and the *tapas* and the *pratimās*, on the other, was that the tortures caused by the former were natural and automatic, whereas that by the latter two, i. e. the *tapas* and the *pratimās*, were self-imposed. Besides the former was not practised by laymen, while a good number of the external austerities like *aṇasaṇa*, *ūṇodariya*, *rasatyāga*, and a few of the internal austerities such as *pratikramaṇa* and *vaiyāvṛtya* were popularly carried on by laymen as well. It may also be noted that out of all these twelve types of austerities, *aṇasaṇa* (fasting) had a very prominent place in the life of a Jaina, householder or ascetic. This is the reason that the Jaina scriptures abound in details as regards different facets of fasting

---

1. In some text only this list of twelve *bhikkhupaḍimās* is mentioned. As such the details as regards number, division and explanation of *paḍimās* vary considerably. For example, the list given in the *Ṭhān*, 84, p, 64b may be compared with those given in the *Bhag*, 2.1.93; pp. 123ab and *Dasā*, sixth *dasā*.

SECTION II

(A) THE SALIENT FEATURES OF BUDDHIST VINAYA

The central philosophy of Buddha's teaching is to get ride of the misery of the world, i. e. the cycle of birth and death. This state can only be attained by threefold acquisition, namely, right way of life *(śīla)*, right meditation *(samādhi)*, and right understanding *(prajñā)*, the first being the base for the acquisition of the latter two. *Śīla*, in the Buddhist tradition, is popularly known as *vinaya*, i. e. rules of conduct to be observed by a mendicant of the Buddhist faith. Now a brief account of such rules which occupy nearly one-third of the Buddhavacana of the Theravāda school compiled as the three piṭakas is being put forward with a view to acquaint the readers with the Buddhist way of life. This brief account will consist of two sub-sections, 'the salient features of Buddhist Vinaya' and 'its background', the main points of study in the former being 'the formation of the order requisites, monastic observances and monastic administration', and those in the latter 'pre-Buddhist beliefs and practices, the Buddhist standpoint and concession alloyed to the ascetics'.

(a) The formation of the Order

The admission to the Buddhist Order is known as *pabbajjā* and the confirmation as *upasampadā*, which will find a detailed discussion at the outset of the first section of the second chapter.

Buddha after attaining the *summum bonum* started his missionary activities with a very simple formula—'etha bhikkhavo' or 'ehi bhikkhū.'[1] The well-known Pañcavaggiyas, Yasa and his fifty-four colleagues were admitted to the order by the aforesaid formula by the Buddha himself. Very soon those devoted disciples of the Buddha brought to him a large number of persons for admission to the Faith. Buddha sensing the Herculean nature of the task, permitted those monks to receive them to the order by a formula known as '*tisaraṇagamanapabbajjā*', admission to the Order by taking threefold refuge. According to this formula, the person getting entrance into the Order, after cutting off his hair and beard and putting on saffron robes, had to accept the Buddha, the Dhamma and the Saṅgha as his refuge.[2]

---

[1] *MV.* 1. 7, 19, pp. 15f.

[2] *Ibid*, 1.11.34, pp. 23-24.

Later on this formula also gave way to a new procedure called *ñatticatutthakammaupasampadā*. According to this procedure, a person fully qualified for admission had to appear before a complete and lawful assembly with an *anusāsaka* (instructor) and to request the assembly for admission. Then after due enquiry about diseases, sex, debt, etc. of the person seeking *upasampadā* (ordination), an announcement for his ordination along with his proposed *upajjhāya* (preceptor) was made before the assembly by a duly qualified monk. The announcement was deemed approved if the Saṅgha was silent. The procedure was completed with the resolution that such and such a person had received *upasampadā* with such and such as his preceptor, announced thrice to the Saṅgha.[1]

Once Mahāprajāpati Gautamī, Buddha's aunt and foster mother made a request to the Buddha at Kapilavastu for the conversion of women. Buddha, as he was unwilling to the conversion of women turned down her request flatly. But she instead of loosing heart followed him to Vaiśālī with a band of Sākyan ladies. There, Ānanda, seeing her pitiable condition and perceiving her intent desire for conversion, advocated her case before the Buddha. Ultimately Gautamī and her following were admitted to the Saṅgha with sevenfold restrictions (*garudhamma*) to be observed by them. These restrictions put the nuns under permanent subjugation to monks. Thus the Order of nuns (*Bhikkhunīsaṅgha*) was formed.[2]

Buddha also converted persons as lay disciples (*upāsaka and upāsikā*). The first such persons to be blessed with the conversion as lay disciples were Tapussa and Bhallika, the renowned merchants of the time. They were converted as lay disciples by the twofold formula, i. e. by going to the refuge of the Buddha and the Dhamma only, even before the preaching of the first sermon.[3]

Those converted first by the threefold formula were Yasa's father, his mother and his former wife. According to this formula, the Buddha or a full-fledged monk perceiving the householder's capacity to receive the Dhamma, preached him or her the four Noble truths (*ariyasaccāni*)—suffering (*dukkha*), the cause of suffering (*dukkhasamudaya*), the cessation of suffering (*dukkhanirodha*) and the path leading to the cessation of suffering (*dukkhanirodhagāminīpaṭipadā*). The householder having got insight into the dhamma i. e.

---

[1] Ibid, 1.68.125-26, pp. 97-99.

[2] *CV*, 10.1-2, pp. 373-77.

[3] *MV*, 1. 4. 6, pp. 5-6.

the transient nature of things, accepted the Buddha, the Dhamma and the Saṅgha as his life-long refuge.[1]

The precepts prescribed : A new male convert is designated as *pabbajita, seha, sāmaṇera, antevāsika* or *saddhivihārika,* and a female as *sāmaṇerī* or *sikkhamānā.* All these terms stand for a person lacking perfection in the tenets. On the contrary a monk of some standing is called *upasampanna, thera* or *mahāthera,* and a nun *therī, mahātherī* or *ayyā.* As such, besides the common rules of conduct, the duties and obligations to be observed by a convert varied according to his or her status in the Church hierarchy.

A person, just after his or her conversion, was admonished to follow the ten commandments (*sikkhāpadāni)* and the rules as regards requisites *(nissayas).* The ten *sikkhāpadas* were abstinence from injury to life, stealing, impure life, lieing, intoxicants, taking meals at worng time, all types of spectacles, use of luxurious beds and receiving costly articles.[2] A transgressor of any one of these rules deserved expulsion from the Order.[3]

The *nissayas* were restrictions regarding food, dress and dwelling, the three main requisites of life. In brief the mendicants were advised to curtail their requirements and to be satisfied with as less possession as they could.[4]

Normally the mendicants were not allowed to live a solitary life. As such a newly admitted monk was given a companion[5], while a nun was prohibited from going to a village or to the other side of a river or to live even for a night alone[6].

A well-behaved conduct and service to all senior as well as junior members of the order in general and an unqualified service to their respective preceptors and teachers in particular were binding on all monks and nuns.[7] Senior monks were advised to address their junior colleagues by name or by family-name (*gotta*) or by the term *āvuso,* while juniors were admonished to address monks senior to them by the term *bhante* or *āyasmā.*[8] The common expression of address for nuns was *ayyā.*[9]

---

1. *MV*, 1. 9. 25–29, pp. 18–23.
2. Ibid, 1. 47. 106, p. 87, Vide *Infra*, Chap. II. Sec. I, 'Precepts for the converts'.
3. Ibid, 1. 53. 51, p. 89.
4. Ibid, 1.22.73, p. 55; 1.69.128, p. 100.
5. Ibid, 1.70.129, p. 100.
6. *PM* (*Bhikkhunī*), 2. 3.
7. *MV*, 1. 18. 64–66, pp. 42–47; 1. 23. 74–78, pp 56–62.
8. *DN*, Vol. II, p. 118.
9. Vide *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*.

Monastic observances like *uposatha* (fort-nightly meeting) *vassāvāsa* (rain-retreat) or *pavāraṇā* (*uposatha* observed just after the close of rain-retreat) were obligatory for monks and nuns both.[1]

Lay disciples are not considered as bonafide members of the Buddhist order. As such Buddhist texts lack in details as regards duties and obligations of lay devotees. In the whole of the Tipiṭaka literature, it is only the *Sigālovādasutta* of the *Dīghanikāya* which is exclusively devoted to the admonition of lay disciples. In brief this *sutta* admonishes a householder to be away from the fourteen evils and to give his or her best services to parents, teachers, wife, children, friends and '*Śramaṇa-brāhmaṇas.*[2] The fourteen evils are more or less identical with the first eight *sikkhāpadas*, which a pious householder is expected to follow. Besides these admonitions, a scanty and scattered references to precepts to be followed by a lay devotee are also found in the *Suttanipāta* of the *Khuddakanikāya*.

Ascetic practices : Buddhist mendicants are also mentioned to have practised rigorous ascetic practices in respect of food, dress and dwelling. These practices known as the *dhutaṅgas* were thirteen in number as the following : (i) use of food procured from begging-tours only (*piṇḍapātikaṅgaṁ*), (ii) begging alms from door to door without any omission (*sapadānacārikaṅgaṁ*), (iii) taking food only once a day (*ekāsanikaṅgaṁ*), (iv) eating food from one bowl only (*pattapiṇḍikaṅgaṁ*), (v) taking no meal again after finishing once (*khalupacchābhattikaṅgaṁ*), (vi) use of robes gathered from dust-heaps (*paṁsukūlikaṅgaṁ*), (vii) using not more than three robes (*tecīvarikaṅgaṁ*), (viii) dwelling in forests (*āraññikaṅgaṁ*), (ix) living under the foot of a tree (*rukkhamūlikaṅgaṁ*), (x) living in open sky (*abbhokāsikaṅgaṁ*), (xi) living in cemetery (*sosānikaṅgaṁ*), (xii) use of whatever bed or seat is available (*yathāsanthatikaṅgaṁ*) and (xiii) spending the night sitting and not lying (*nessajjikaṅgaṁ*).[3] These practices which obviously appear contradictory to the principle of *majjhimāpaṭipadā*, find no mention in the canonical texts. Very likely *dhutaṅgas* meant only for those who liked them.

The appearance and outfit : Every religious sect or school adopts an outfit peculiar to it in order to distinguish itself from others. The Buddhist mendicants preferred saffron-coloured (*kasāya*) robes and wore it in such a way as to keep their right shoulders always naked. They wore small tuft of hair on their heads as the maximum

---

1 Vide Chap. III.

2. *DN*, Vol. III, pp. 139-149.

3. *Visuddhimaggo*, Dhutaṅganiddesa; *Milindapañho*, Dhutaṅgakathā,

length of the hair allowed to them being two month's growth or two fingers in length. The hair was not to be smoothed with comb and oily substance.[1] The total number of equipments *(parikkhāra)* and outfit allowed to the monks were eight only, viz., three robes, one begging bowl, a razor, a niddle, a waistband *(kāyabandhana)* and a water strainer.[2] Later on the use of light and simple shoes[3], and umbrella[4] were made permissible to them as well.

The outfit and equipments sanctioned to the nuns were almost the same. The nuns could use a few pieces of small cloth as bathing-robes *(udakasāṭika)*,[5] etc in addition to those allowed to monks. Obviously the appearance of the nuns tallied with the monks

Dressed as above one can easily see a monk or a nun even nowadays in monasteries and outside particularly in Buddhist countries like Ceylon, Berma, etc. They may appear a bit modern owing to their use of things manufactured anew.

Causes of renunciation: Though renouncing household life had become a popular custom in those days, persons did not take to monkhood often without any reason. Sometimes they took to monk life because of their natural insight into the truth, while at others being impressed by the preachings of the Buddha or his disciples. Inauspicious circumstances such as child's or husband's demise, insight into the transient nature of bodily beauty, abhorrence to household drudgery, humiliation in worldly life or the like acted as the cause of renunciation. The *Theragāthā* and the *Therīgāthā* are replete with examples in point.

Bars to admission : At the outset there was no bar to admission. But experiences in monastic life constrained Buddha to be strict so far as conversion of a person was concerned. As such persons inflicted with either of the five incurable diseasses[6] (leprosy, boils, eczema, consumption and fits), royal soldiers *(rājabhaṭa)*, robbers, thieves, debtors, slaves *(dāsa)*, persons with cut off or deformed limbs and persons sexually deformed or lacking any limb, for instance, a one-eyed person, a person with crooked limb, a lame, a person paralysed on one side (*pakkhahata*), a cripple (*chinniriyāpatha*), a blind, a dumb, a deaf, a blind and dumb, etc., were declared unfit for monastic life.[1]

---

[1] *CV*, 5. 14, p. 195.

[2] ticivarañca patto ca, vāsi sūci ca bandhanaṁ/
parissāvanena aṭṭhete, yutayogassa bhikkhuno//
Samantapāsādikā, Vol. I, p. 233.

[3] *MV*, 5 3. 7, p. 204.

[4] *CV*, 5. 11. 28, p. 219.

[5] *MV*, 8. 17. 25, p, 309.

[6] Vide Chap. II, Sec I. for details.

Persons weak from old age[2] and boys below fifteen years of age were not to be admitted into the Order. In due course the latter were allowed *pabbajjā* (admission or initiation), if they were able to scare crow (*kākuṭṭepaka*).[3] A person without the sanction of one's parents[4] or without begging-bowl and robes[5] too was not entitled for admission.

The laws as regards confirmation of admission (*upasampadā*) of a person was not less strict. It was to be granted to a person full twenty years of age from the time of conception in mother's womb.[6] Similarly a *theyyasaṁvāsaka* (a person furtively joining the Saṅgha), a *titthiyapakkantaka* (an apostate), or a *tiracchānagata* (an animal), a *mātughātaka* (a matricide), a *pitughātaka* (a parricide), *arahantaghātaka* (a murderer of an arahanta), a *bhikkhunīdūsaka*. (a violator of a nun), *saṅghabhedaka* (a dissenter) and a *lohituppādaka* (a person causing injury to the person of the Buddha) were unfit for ordination and deserved expulsion, if already ordained.[7]

The authority competent to admit candidates : The final authority competent to confer *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* on a person was a complete and lawful Saṅgha, the minimum quorum for which was ten.[8] All the monks forming the Saṅgha in general and the two officers, that is, *anusāsaka* and *upajjhāya*, the former having the main role at the time of conversion and the latter after the conversion of the monk-to-be, in particular must be well-experienced, highly qualified and of perfect morality.[9]

Mutual relation between a teacher and a disciple : A newly converted person was placed under the direct supervision of a *gurū*. Such *gurūs* were known as *upajjhāya* (preceptor) and *ācariya* teacher) who were responsible for training novices in the tenets of Buddhism. A novice placed under the charge of an *upajjhāya* was known as *saddhivihārika* and that of an *ācariya* as *antevāsika*. This relation of a novice with an

---

1. *MV*, 1. 62. 119, pp. 94-95.
2. Ibid, 1. 62. 119, p. 95.
3. Ibid, 1. 42. 100, p. 82.
4. Ibid, 1. 46. 105, pp. 86-87.
5. Ibid, 1. 61, 118, pp. 93-94.
6. Ibid, 1. 67. 124, p. 97.
7. Ibid, 1. 53-59. 110-116, pp. 89-92.
8. Ibid, 9. 4. 9, pp. 334-335.
9. Ibid, 1. 28-29. 84-85, pp. 67-73.

ācariya or an *upajjhāya* was termed *nissaya* (dependance). The *nissaya* of a novice towards the *ācariya* came to an end, if the *ācariya* and the *upajjhāya* came together.

A novice must behave decently with all monks senior as well as junior to him. He must also do all the menial works of the whole monastery in general and that of his *upajjhāya* and *ācariya* in particular. Accordingly a novice served his *upajjhāya* or *ācariya* in many ways during a day. In the morning he supplied him tooth-cleanser, rinsing water, a seat and rice-gruel and washed the bowl of the rice-gruel. He made the necessary arrangements to enable him to go on begging-tour and also accompanied him. He returned earlier to him to provide him with a seat, water and a towel. In the same manner he helped him in his bath also.

The menial works of the monastery consisted of sweeping the different apartments of the monastery, ramoving the cobwebs, mopping the walls, casting aside the sweepings, brushing the furniture and utensils and keeping them back at their proper places.

A disciple may also guide his preceptor or teacher in doctrinal and ecclesiastical matters, if there is such a necessity.[1]

It is to be borne in mind that the duties of an *upajjhāya*[2] or an *ācariya*[3] towards his disciple were almost identical with those of a disciple towards his *upajjhāya* or *ācariya*.

Thus this identical list of mutual duties and obligations gives the impression that a preceptor or a teacher and a disciple were given the same status in the Church hierarchy. But actually this was not the case. There were laws which made a disciple subordinate to a teacher.[4]

Relation between monks and nuns : It has already been remarked that the conditions laid down for the formation of the Order of nuns put the nuns under permanent subordination to monks. Not only a nun was denied the right of admonishing a monk while a monk was allowed to admonish a nun, but was also enjoined upon to bow down before a monk even just initiated. So also a nun, besides being debarred from reviling a monk and observing the retreat in an *āvāsa*

---

[1] *MV*, 1. 18. 64-66, pp. 42-47; 1.23. 74-78, pp. 56-62; *CV*, 8. 12. 22-23, pp. 332-36; 8. 14. 26-27, pp. 341-45.

[2] *MV*. 1. 18. 67-68, pp. 48-51; *CV*, 8. 11. 20-21, pp. 328-32.

[3] *MV*, 1. 24. 79, pp. 62-65; *CV*, 8. 13. 24-25, pp. 336-40.

[4] Vide *Infra* Chap. II, Sec. I.

(residence) without monks, was obliged to undergo the *mānatta* discipline and confess her omissions and commissions committed during the retreat with reference to the Order of monks as well. Likewise a *sāmaṇerī* had to seek the necessary permission from the Order of monks prior to her ordination.[1]

In the *uposatha* meetings convened by the nuns, the *Pātimokkha* was recited by the monks on behalf of the nuns so long as they did not know its recitation.[2] Later on the nuns had only to seek the necessary consultation from the Order of monks as regards the date of the ensuing *uposatha* fairly in advance.[3] It is remarkable that the recitation of the *Pātimokkha* was prohibited in an assembly of monks attended by a nun. etc.[4]

The Pāli canon is replete with instances of false accusations and conspiracies made against a monk by a nun voluntarily or on instigation from others. The Buddhist Order took every precaution in order to check such ugly incidents that were imminent owing to the contact between a monk and a nun. As such any sort of transaction of requisites between a monk and a nun was not allowed. For instance, a monk was not allowed, if the nun was not related to him, to give to or to receive from or to get prepared a robe for her.[5] Similarly a monk was not allowed to enjoy the food procured by the intervention of a nun[6] or to receive food from a nun in course of begging[7].

It is true that the position of a nun was inferior to a monk with reference to individual privileges of the Order. But the Order of nuns was in no way subordinate to the Order of monks so far as the share of requisites was concerned. This is evidenced by the law that a gift of robes, offered to both the Orders of monks and nuns, was to be distributed equally to monks and nuns. The Orders of monks and nuns were entitled to get equal share, even though the numbers of monks and nuns constituting the Order of monks and nuns respectively was as less as one.[8]

Relation with heretics : It is remarkable that the Buddha is never mentioned to have come face to face with any one of the six heretical

---

1. *CV*, 10. 1 2, pp. 373--77.
2. Ibid, 10. 5. 6, pp. 379- 80.
3. Ibid, 10. 2 2--3, p. 375; *PM* (*Bhikkhunī*), 4: 59; *Aṅguttaranikāya*, Vol. III, p. 371.
4 *MV*, 2--38.52, pp 141f.
5. Ibid, 8. 10. 10--37, pp 299--314.
6. *PM*, 5. 29.
7. *PM*, 6. 1.
8. *MV*, 8. 30. 54, pp. 324--25.

teachers often referred to in the Tipiṭaka. There was every chance of his coming across at least with Mahāvīra whose diocese of religions activity almost coincided with that of the Buddha. Whatever might have been the case, the attitude of the Buddhists towards the heretics whom they often called as *aññatitthiyas*, on the whole, does not appear to be compromising and accommodating. They are seen criticising the Nigaṇṭhas, their nearest rival, at several places in the Nikāyas. Similarly almost all other teachers and leaders of the time interviewed with the Buddha are stated to have surrendered to his towering personality.

The Buddhists, while they were so much critical of the heretics and their doctrines, derived positive benefit from them and their teachings Thus they introduced the customs of *Uposatha* and *Vassāvāsa* (rain-retreal) to their Order at the instance of the heretics. At the same time, in their effort to keep themselves distinguished from the heretics, they also banned the use of a good number of articles of daily use simply because of their use among the heretics.[1]

Any way, they neither put a bar to the conversion of heretics nor prescribed any probation for them prior to their conversion. They received them freely so long as their faith did not come out as a prominent sect of the time. No sooner they found themselves well-established than they introduced a probation of four months for persons coming from other religious order. Such persons intending entry into the Buddhist Order must duly observe the restrictions imposed on them. These restrictions which were six in number were more or less pertaining to moral life, training in the Dhamma, making them free from the influence of their previous persuasion and inculcating faith in the Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha. Though these restrictions were obligatory for all, the Jaṭilas and the Sākyas were granted concession in this regards.[2]

(b) The requisites

A person taking refuge in the Buddhist Order was made aware with the rules of *nissayas* (requisites) just after his conversion. The *nissayas*, i.e 'the limited means of sustenance and support of life' were four, viz, *piṇḍiyālopabhojana*—the use of food gathered from begging-tours, *paṁsukūlacīvara*—the use of dress prepared from rags gathered from dust-heaps and cemeteries, *rukkhamūlasenāsana*—the use of the root of a tree as residence, and *pūtimuttabhesajja*—the use of stinking-urine as medicine. In due course these were repaired with appropriate extra-allowances (*atirekalābha*).

---

[1] Vide *Infra*, p. 50, 53.

[2] *MV*, 1. 30. 86-87, p. 73-76.

Proper food : It has just been remarked that the use of food gathered from begging-tours was the ancient rule which, because of unavoidable circumstances and reasons, was relaxed with the permission to enjoy community dinner, food for appointed persons, invitations, etc.[1] This relaxation led to the promulgation of innumerable rules as regards the nature of food and bowls, time of begging, the way of proceeding to the village, receiving articles of food and eating, quantity of food, and storing up articles of food, etc.

Rice-gruel (*yāgu*) was the most common food of the monks. Besides, five kinds of delicacies—ghee, butter, oil, honey and molasses, which were treated as medicine; preparation from molasses and kidney-bean (*mugga*); and honey-lumps (*madhugolaka*)[2]; five products of the cow—milk, curd, ghee, butter-milk and butter ; eatable herbs (*dāka*); flour eatables (*piṭṭhakhādanīya*) and fruits[3] were also allowed to them.

So far as drinks were concerned monks were allowed the use of syrups prepared from fruits like mango, jumbu, etc., leaves and flowers. Besides, *ucchurasa* (juice of sugar-cane), *guḷodaka* (sugar-water) and *udakasambhinna* (water as beverage) were also permissible to them. Drinking water containing living beings knowingly was an offence.[4]

The monks were allowed the use of meat and fish, not prepared purposely for them.[5] They were however debarred form taking flesh of men and such animals as elephant, horse, serpent, lion, etc.[6]

In normal circumstances a healthy monk was prohibited from taking more than one meal at a public rest-house (*āvasatha-piṇḍa)*, taking food with more than three persons (*gaṇa-bhojana*), enjoying meal in turn (*paramparā-bhojana* [7], receiving food from lay-devotees under discipline (*sekhasammatāni kulāni)*, taking food at his own house (*ajjhārāme*) [8], begging delicacies for his own use[9], accepting an invitation for more than a period of four months without being invited again[10] and taking food afresh or already left after finishing once[11]. So also food procured by worldly arts and crafts as livelihood,[1] or by the intervention of a nun,[2] or after preaching the *dhamma* (a religious discourse),[3] or from a nun in course of begging[4] was not allowed to the monks.

---

[1] saṅghabhattaṁ, uddesabhattaṁ, nimantanaṁ, salākabhattaṁ, pakkhikaṁ, uposathikaṁ, pāṭipadikaṁ. *MV*, 1. 22. 73, p. 55.

[2] *MV*, 6. 1. 1, p. 218; 6. 4. 13, p. 228.

[3] Ibid, 6. 22. 41, p. 258; 6. 24. 44, p. 262.

[4] Ibid, 6. 4. 14, p. 228; 6. 13. 25, p. 242; 6. 23. 42, p. 260.

[5] Ibid, 6. 9. 21, p. 235.

[6] Ibid, 6. 10. 22, pp. 235–36.

[7] *PM*, 5 31–33.

[8] Ibid, 6. 3–4.

[9] Ibid, 5. 39.

[10] Ibid, 6. 47.

[11] Ibid, 5.85.

The begging-bowl, commonly known as *patta*, is one of the eight equipments allowed to a monk. The rules pertaining to its material, use and maintenance come thus in the *Vinayapiṭaka*. The use of a begging-bowl made of costly metals as gold (*sovaṇṇa*), silver (*rupiya*), pearl (*maṇi*), beryl (*veluriya*), crystal (*phalika*), bell-metal (*kaṁsa*), glass (*kāca*), tin (*tipu*), lead (*sisa*), copper (*tambaloha*) and bronze (*loha*) is not allowed to a monk. So also a bowl made of wood (*dāru*) or decorated with beautiful figures and linings is demeed unfit for the use of a monk. The use of gourd (*tumbakaṭāha*), turtle-shell (*ghaṭikaṭāha*) or human skull (*chavasīsa*) as bowl is denied to a monk on account of its use among the *titthiyas* (heretics). Thus only a bowl made either of iron (*aya*) or of clay (*mattikā*) is allowed to the Buddhists.[5]

Moreover monks are enjoined upon to use and maintain their bowls with due care. They are allowed the use of a stand, etc. for the protection of their bowls[6] and are forbidden from keeping their bowls in the sun with water in them or at a dangerous place like the edge of sleeping bench, etc.[7]

The monks had to proceed to a village in a way prescribed to them by the Order. Such methods fixed for attending a community-dinner and starting a begging-tour were known as *bhattaggavatta* and *piṇḍacārikavatta* respectively. According to the rule of *bhattaggavatta*, a mendicant clad properly and provided with a begging-bowl, set out slowly and carefully with downcast eyes not pushing one's way in front of the seniors. Proceeding to a village with disordered robes, long laughter, swaying limbs, hands on the heaps and unusual gait looking to and fro was strictly prohibited. So also, when taking a seat in the house of a donor he should neither encroach on the seniors nor debar a junior form his seat. Thus he should receive food in his begging bowl washed properly with the water given before the meal.

---

1. *DN*, Vol. I, pp. 7–12.
2. *PM*, 5. 29.
3. *KN*. Vol. I, *Suttanipāta*, 1. 4. 81, p. 282.
4. *PM*, 6. 1.
5 *CV*, 5. 5. 10–13, pp. 201–213.
6. Ibid, 5. 5. 12, p. 203; 5. 8. 22, p. 213.
7. Ibid, 5. 5. 12, p. 202–203.

Receiving food more than one's fill or less than required purposely was deemed a sinful act.[1]

The momks tried their best to adhere to the social customs and etiquettes. Therefore even a senior member was not allowed to start eating till the food had not been served to all or to wash his hands and bowl till taking of food was not finished. So also eating or dining together in one dish or vessel was not permitted to them.

Besides, such behaviour as pressing the food from the top, gazing at others bowl with greed and eagerness, making a very large mouthful opening the month quite in advance, putting the whole hand in the mouth, talking with food in the mouth, tossing the food in the mouth, biting the food playfully, stuffing the cheeks with food and the like were deemed unworthy of a monk.[2]

The community dinner was closed with the act of thanks-giving. Very likely this act comprised of a religious discourse preached to the donor by the invitee-monks. Though the senior most monk was entrusted with the duty, others sharing the dinner were also to wait till the end of the ceremony.[3]

This was in brief the process of 'attending a community-dinner'. The way of 'proceeding on a begging-tour' was almost identical with the process of 'attending a community dinner'. Besides, the following may be noted as special features of the former.

Nobody was allowed to force his way into a house where a meal was going on from before, much less to take a seat there. If needed to go inside a house, he must thoroughly inspect the way of entrance and exit before going inside it. When entered inside a house, he must stay at a considerable distance from the donor for a limited period of time, if there was any hope of getting alms. After receiving the alms with downcast eyes, he should come back to the monastery self-possessed and with the bowl covered up with robe. The monk returning first from the begging-tour had to open the service-hall (*upaṭṭhānasālā*) and arrange it with necessary articles and one returning last had to close it.[4]

Thus they could take only one meal a day, which must be finished by mid-day as taking food or entering a village (for alms)

---

1. *CV*, 8. 5. 9. pp. 317–18; 8. 6. 11, p. 320 ; *PM*, 7. 1–26.
2. Ibid, 5. 8. 22, p. 213.
3. Ibid, 8. 5. 9, pp. 318–19 ; *PM*, 7. 27--56.
4. Ibid, 8. 6. 11, pp. 320–21

untimely, i.e., from sun-turn in one day till sun-rise in the next was a sinful act.[1]

No direct mention is made of the quantum of food to be taken by the monks. They are simply advised to take as much food as is required to maintain life for practising celibacy.[2] As such they take food with a view to appease the arisen pangs of hunger and to check its further origination, and not to put on flesh for personal charm and beauty.[3]

Though the issue of storing up articles of food even as trifling a thing as salt had been a hot bed of contention among the Buddhists themselves[4], the monks were however permitted to possess all sorts of medicaments in general and the five delicacies in particular.[5] A life-long possession of certain roots for use in case of emergency was also sanctioned to them.[6]

So also storing up food-stuff procured from gifts, etc. as well as cooking inside the monastery was allowed in days of scarcity only.[7] This privilege, which was often discontinued[8] as soon as the alms were available in abundance, necessitated a *kappiyabhūmi*[9] (a warehouse) and an *upaṭṭhānasāla*[10] (a service-hall) to facilitate storing up articles of food and cooking respectively. Besides the *kappiyakāraka* whose duty was to make things permissible to monks, several officers were appointed to look after the acquisition, preservation and distribution of the articles of food properly.[11]

Proper dress and its use : The Buddhists, unlike the Jainas, etc., preferred the use of the least possible cloth to complete nudity. Therefore they admonished their followers to dress inasmuch cloth as was sufficient to protect the body from the inclement weather and keep the private parts out of sight[12] Initially this purpose of the Buddhists was fulfilled with robes made of rags gathered from dust-heaps and cemeteries (*paṁsukūla*).[1] Subsequently this practice was made optional with the sanction to put on lay-robes (*gahapati-cīvara*)[2] made of flax (*khoma*), cotton (*kappāsa*), silk (*koseyya*), wool (*kambala*) and hemp (*sāṇa-bhaṅga*).[3]

---

[1] *PM*, 5. 37, 85.
[2] *DN*, Vol. I, pp. 62-63.
[3] *MN*, Vol. I, p. 13.
[4] *CV*, 12. 2. 13, p. 422.
[5] *MV*, 6. 3. 12, p. 248; *PM*, 5. 23.
[6] Ibid, 6. 2. 4. p. 219.
[7] Ibid, 6. 5. 15, pp. 229-30.
[8] Ibid, 6. 20. 36, pp. 253-54.
[9] Ibid.
[10] *CV*, 6 1. 8. p, 246.
[11] Vide *Infra*, Chap. IV, Sec. I.
[12] *DN*, Vol I, pp. 62-63; *MN*, Vol I, p. 14.

Normally the Buddhists liked those material and colour for their dress, which were not used by the heretics. The use of robes made of grass (*kusa*), bark (*bāka*), feathers (*pakkha*) and skin (*ajinakkhipa*), etc. was banned on this very plea.[4] Likewise, except those dyed saffron (*kasāya*), all other robes which were coloured blue, yellow, crimson, brown, black and the like were discarded by them.[5] The dyeing materials allowed to them were made from roots, trunks, bark, leaves, flowers and fruits of trees.[6]

Of course, the problem of seeking robes was made easy for the monks with the sanction to use lay-robes. But at the same time strict restrictions were imposed on them in order to arrest the frivolous use of this laxity, which are manifest in the regulations debarring a monk from asking a laity for robes, giving materials or directions to weavers, giving to or receiving a robe from a nun not related to him.[7] It was really very difficult for the mendicants to get their share reserved in the *kaṭhina* robes, one of the important sources of getting robes, as there were a good number of causes for debarring them from their due share.

Unlike the Jainas, the Buddhists preferred robes made out of small pieces of cloth sewn together. Ordinarily they used a set of three robes—a double waist-cloth (*saṅghāṭi*), a single upper-garment (*uttarāsaṅga*) and a single under-garment (*antaravāsaka*).[8] So also the dress of the nuns normally consisted of the same three robes.[9] Besides this, the monks as well as the nuns were allowed some extra pieces of cloth like rain-robe (*vassikasāṭaka*)[10], itch-cloth (*kaṇḍupaṭicchādiṁ*)[11], bathing-robe (*udakasāṭika*)[12], etc. for their occasional use.

---

[1] *MV*, 1. 22. 73, p. 53.

[2] Ibid, 8. 8. 12, p. 297.

[3] Ibid, 1. 22. 73, p. 53.

[4] Ibid, 8. 25. 46, pp. 320–321.

[5] Ibid, 8. 26. 47, p. 321.

[6] Ibid, 8. 13. 19, pp. 302–303.

[7] Ibid, 8. 10-19.10-37 pp, 299–314.

[8] Ibid, 8. 15. 21, pp. 304-5.

[9] *Vinaya Texts* (*SBE*. Vol. XVII), p. 213 fn.

[10] *MV*, 8. 17. 27, p. 310.

[11] Ibid, 8. 18. 29, p. 311.

[12] Ibid, 8. 17. 27, p. 310.

Monks were often warned to dress themselves properly.[1] Particularly, when visiting the house of a laity[2] or entering a village[3], they must not be ill-clad. Departing from any one of the usual set of three robes was allowed in some special circumstances only. For instance a forest-dweller(*āraññaka*) was allowed to do so as forest-dwelling was insecure and dangerous.[4]

Like the food-stuff, the authority for acquisition, preservation and distribution of robes was vasted in certain officers of the Order appointed for the purpose.[5]

Recidence and bed :—The foot of a tree (*rukkhamūla*) was the only resort allowed to a Buddhist monk in the begining of the order. This law was relaxed by permitting the use of a *vihāra* (monastery), an *aḍḍhayoga* (a pinnacled house), a *pāsāda* (a storeyed building), a *hammiya* (an attic) and a *guhā* (a cave) as dwelling places.[6] As a result of this relaxation a large number of buildings were offered to the Buddhist Order for its use, which enabled the Buddha to permit the monks to supervise the repair or construction of buildings Accordingly not only monk-officers like *Narakammika*, etc. were appointed for the purpose but a monk was also allowed to construct a buiding for his personal use.[7]

The ideal site for the construction of a *vihāra* is described in great detail.[8] Besides the site which must be free from dangers and disturbances, a mention is also made about the size and shape of the building.[9] Normally a *pariveṇa* (*a courtyard*), a *koṭṭhaka* (a store-room), an (*upaṭṭhānasālā* (a service-hall), an *aggisālā* (a fire-place), a *kappiyakuṭi* (a warehouse), a *vaccakuṭi* (a privy), a *caṅkama* (a cloister), an *udapāna* (a well), a *jantāghara* (a bath-room), a *pokkharaṇi* (a pond) and a *maṇḍapa* (a portico) were accommodated in the premises of an *āvāsa* (residence).[10] Thus the campus inhabited by the mendicants was usually self contained and free from inconveniences to celibate life. The Bhddhists were allowed to use all sorts of furniture like beds, seats,

---

1. *PM*, 7 1-2.
2. Ibid, 7. 3–4.
3. *MV*, 8. 19. 37, p. 313.
4. *PM*. 4 19.
5. Vide *Infra*, Chap. IV, Sec. I.
6. *MV*, 1. 22. 73, p. 55.
7. *CV*, 6 11. 30, pp. 268-272.
8. Vide *Infra*, 'Rukkhamūlasenāsana'.
9. *PM*, 2. 6-7.
10. *MV*, 1. 18. 66, pp. 45-46; 1. 19. 67, pp. 49-50; 1. 23. 78, pp. 59-60 ; 1. 24. 79, pp 63-64; *CV*, 8. 8. 15, pp. 323-24; *EMB*, p. 286.

arm-chairs, sofas, cushioned chairs, foot-stools, carpets, matresses, pillows, bolsters and spitoons, etc. As such a *vihāra* was well furnished with these articles.[1] Moreover, hair-splitting rules were laid down for the acquisition, maintenance, possession, transfer and use of these articles properly.[2]

Diseases and curses : *Bhesajja* (medicine) was the fourth requisite of the Buddhist order. The use of stinking-urine *(pūtimutta[3])* as medicine was the ancient rule, which was repaired with the permission to use five types of delicacy, namely, ghee, butter, oil, honey and molasses.[4] It may be noted that the Pāli canon is replete with references to various types of diseases along with the way of their prevention and cure. As such a long list of things to be used as medicament by the monks can be had from it.[5] In this connection it may also be mentioned that surgical operation as treatment of a disease was also allowed to the Buddhist order.[6]

(c) Monastic observances

Uposatha, *Vassāvāsa* and *Pavāraṇā* were the three monastic observances which the Buddhist mendicants observed regularly. We would find that these observances, in some form or other, were already in vogue in pre-Buddhist Indian monastic systems and the Buddhists adopted them most likely to be on a par with them.

Uposatha : *Uposatha* was one of the most important observances of the Buddhist Order. Started as a religious gathering, it finally took the shape of a monastic observance.[7] Originally held on the eighth, the fourteenth and the fifteenth days of a fortnight, it began to be observed on the last day of a fortnight only.[8] Hence uposatha, i. e., fortnightly meeting is the name given to it.

Uposatha was to be held at a place selected by the Saṅgha. Five kinds of buildings were regarded fit for the purpose.[9] Fixing

---

1. Vide *Infra*, 'Rukkhamūlasenāsana'.
2. *MV*, 8. 24. 44, p. 319; Vide *Infra* for rules regarding Ownership, etc.
3. Kosambiji interprets it as cow-urine—"pūtimuttaṁ ti gomuttaṁ". Vide *Visuddhimaggadīpikā*, 1. 68. *Haritakīkhaṇḍa* (myrobalan) is given as a substitute for *pūtimutta* as medicine. *MN*, *Mahāniddesa; Visuddhimaggo*, 1. 68.
4. *MV*, 6. 1. 1–2, pp. 218-19.
5. Vide *Infra*, '*Pūtimuttabhasajja*' for details.
6. *MV*, 6. 2. 8, p. 224; 6. 8. 20, p. 233.
7. Ibid, 2. 1. 1 and 2 2. 2, p. 106.
8. Ibid, 2. 2. 5, p. 108; *PM*, '*Nidāna*'.
9. Ibid, 2. 5. 10, pp. 109-10.

two *uposothāgāra* (*uposatha*-hall) in one *āvāsa* (residence) was unlawful. It was to be solemnised in the *āvāsa* of the senior monks, if there were a number of *āvāsas* in one *sīmā* (boundary). It could also be observed in the personal cell of a monk under unavoidable cirumstances.[1]

Sīmā or the jurisdiction of an *āvāsa* was decided by fixing some landmarks on the boundary of the jurisdiction.[2] It was however forbidden to fix a boundary either of very long distance or overlapping another one.[3]

Junior monks had to do the necessary preparations before the monks assembled in the *uposatha-hall* to hold *uposatha*. These preparations comprised of providing the hall with seats, lighted lamp and drinking water after sweeping it well [4]

The recitation of the *Pātimokkha* in a complete and pure chapter of monks or nuns was one of the most dominating features of the *uposatha*. Normally it was recited in full by a senior monk. But its recitation in abridged form was also allowed in case of troubles and dangers.[5] Nuns were finally allowed to recite the *Pātimokkha* themselves.[6] The confession of an offence by a guilty monk took place in course of the recitation of the section concerned. Those who observed silence during the recitation of a particular section indicated their purity with respect to the offences comprising that section. A common confession of an offence or a common acceptance of such confession was not allowed. In case all the monks of an *āvāsa* were guilty of a common offence, one of them confessed his guilt before a monk of a nearby *āvāsa* and the rest before him after his return.

All the monks living within the *sīmā* of an *āvāsa* must be present or must send their consent (*chanda*) in absentia. The Buddhist Order was not at all lenient in this regard. Keeping oneself absent from the *uposatha* even on the ground of personal purity was not allowed. Buddha's admonition to Mahākappin is an instance in point. Thus only an *uposatha* performed lawfully by a complete chapter was deemed valid.[7]

---

1. *MV*, 2. 20. 33, pp. 121-22; 2. 21. 34, p. 123.
2. Ibid, 2. 4. 7, p. 109.
3. Ibid, 2. 9. 17, p. 113.
4. Ibid, 2. 18. 28-31, pp. 119-20; *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇi*, p. 11.
5. Ibid, 2. 11, 19, p. 114.
6. *CV*, 10. 5. 6, pp. 379-80.
7. *MV*, pp. 108-129.

Mahāvagga refers to four types of *uposatha.* They are (i) *Saṅgha-uposatha*, (ii) *Pārisuddhi--uposatha*, (iii) *Addhiṭṭhāna-uposatha*, and (iv) *Saṅgha-sāmaggi-uposatha*,,the first being an *uposatha* performed lawfully by a complete chapter of monks, while the last an *uposatha* performed on any day for the reconciliation of the order[1]. Besides, the *Aṅguttaranikāya* refers to *Gopālaka*, *Nigaṇṭha* and *Ariya uposatha*, the first two observed by the Jaina householders and the last by the Buddhists themselves.[2]

Vassāvāsa : It has been a custom with the Buddhist mendicants to live at one place during the rains which was termed *vassāvāsa* 'rain-retreat). This custom was introduced to the Buddhist Order with a view to be in conformity with other monastic sects, to abstain from inflicting injury to microscopic living beings and to avoid troubles of travels during the rains.

The Buddhists started living at one place after the full-moon day of *Asāḷha* (June-July) or a month after it. The former was known as the earlier (*purimikā*) and the latter as later period (*pacchimikā*) of retreat. Monks or nuns intending to enter upon the retreat came to a *vihāra* (monastery) on the day following the full-moon day of *Asāḷha* or a month after it, prepared a lodging place, swept the cell, got drinking water and food ready and started observing the retreat. This is in brief the process of entering upon the retreat.[3]

Observing the retreat was obligatory to all without any exception[4]. Neither a person observing the retreat could go on tour during the retreat-period nor he or she could leave his or her residence permanently. But this strictness could not continue for long. The mendicants were allowed to interrupt the retreat for a week, if sent for by any one of the seven classes of people, namely a monk, a nun, etc. for offering an abode, etc. to them. Besides they could also leave their residence for a week during the retreat in order to attend the marriage negotiation of the son or daughter of a lay devotee or to learn the recitation of a *sutta* from him or to attend upon him in case of his sickness. Later on they were also allowed to break the retreat for a week even without being sent for with a view to perform some important and urgent duty of the Saṅgha or to attend upon any one of the seven classes of people, namely, a monk, a nun, a probationary, woman, a novice, mother or father.[5]

---

1. *Op. cit.*, 2. 24. 37, pp. 125-26; 2. 38. 52, p. 142.
2. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I,3.7.10, p. 190-91.
3. *MV*, 3. 1. 1, p. 144; *CV*, 6. 6. 25, p. 263.
4. Ibid, 3. 2. 2-3, pp. 144 f.
5. Ibid, 2. 19. 32, pp. 120-21; 3. 3. 5-8, pp. 146-49.

Besides, a permanent transfer of the residence observing the retreat was also allowed to them in case of danger or trouble to their physical or moral life.[1]

The place where the mendicants intended to keep retreat must be free from inconveniences and dangers to life. Accordingly a hollow tree, branches of a tree, a house for dead bodies, a sun-shade, an earthen vessel and open sky were declared unfit for observing retreat. An *aḍḍhayoga*, a *vihāra*, a *hammiya*, an attic and a cave were regarded as the best places for keeping retreat. Next to these were a cattle-pen, a caravan and a ship. But these places were not completely reliable and much less suited to all types of persons.[2]

Monks were admonished to observe the retreat with their companions [3] But they must not neglect the interests of lay-devotees on that account. As such the promise made with a lay-devotee to keep the retreat at his house was in no case to be broken. The retreat started at a lay-devotee's house was deemed invalid if the monk leaving the place of retreat did not return within the stipulated period.[4]

Before summing up, it may be noted that the monks performed the *saṅgha-kammas* (tansactions of the order) as usual and did not allow to suffer them on account of the stagnant life during the rains. Thus the institution of the retreat not only relieved the Buddhists of the strenuous journey of the rainy season but also provided them an oppotunity for moral edification.

Pavāraṇā : *Pavāraṇā* is the name given to the first *uposatha* held just after the end of the rain-retreat. This interpretation of *pavāraṇā* is evidenced by the fact that the details as regards *pavāraṇā* are almost similar to those of the *uposatha*. Thus confession of one's offence committed during the *vassā* is the only purpose of celebrating the *pavāraṇā*.

(d) Monastic administration

Church Units : The spread of the Buddhist faith to far and wide and the increase in the number of mendicants led the Buddha to divide his priesthood in small units and appoint officers for their control. Prominent among these units were *saṅgha*, and *gaṇa*.

---

1. *MV*, 3. 7. 17-18, pp. 155-57.
2. Ibid, 3 9-10. 20-2', pp, 158-59; 2. 19. 32, p. 121.
3. *DN*, Vol. II, p. 79.
4. *MV*, 3. 12. 24-25, pp. 161-64.

The *saṅgha* was perhaps the largest unit and as such it often denoted the whole priesthood. The *gaṇa* was a small unit consisting of at least five monks or nuns.

Officers : Officers who controlled and administered the Order may be classified in three groups as the following : (i) Officers in charge of moral training, (ii) custodians of religious scriptures and (iii) officers in charge of requisites of the Order. Worthy of mention among the officers in charge of moral training were *upajjhāya*, *ācariya*, *anusāsaka* and *sāmaṇera-pesaka*. *Upajjhāya* and *ācariya* trained novices in the way of monkhood As such the qualifications required of an *upajjhāya* or *ācariya* were the same, i. e., at least ten years' experience in monkhood and a perfect knowledge of the two *Pātimokkhas*. No mention is made about the qualifications of *anusāsaka* and *sāmaṇera-pesaka* To make the monk-to-be conversant with the etiquette to be observed at the ordination ceremony was the only duty of the *anusāsaka*.

The custodians of religious scriptures are designated as *Dhammadhara*, *Vinayadhara*, *Mātikādhara*, *Suttantika*, etc. The master of the *Dhamma* is known as *Dhammadhara* and that of the *Vinaya* as *Vinayadhara*. The best examples in point are Ānanda and Upāli respectively. *Mātikādhara* is the master of *Mātikās*, i. e. *Abhidhamma*. *Suttantika* seems to be a synonym of *Dhammadhara*

Officers in charge of requisites comprised of officers responsible for food, dress and dwelling places, the first three out of the four requisites of a monk. *Bhattuddesaka* and *Khajjabhājaka* were the two prominent officers responsible for the distribution and allotment of food and drink to the members of the Order. *Yāgubhājaka*, *Phalabhājaka*, *Cīvabhājaka*, etc. were officers who supervised the distribution of insignificant articles of food and drink like rice-gruel and fruits, etc.

Cīvarapaṭiggāhaka, *Cīvaranidahaka*, *Bhandāgārika*, *Sāṭiyaggahāpaka* and *Cīvarabhājaka* were officers responsible for the acquisition, preservation and distribution of robes. Similarly *Senāsanaggahāpaka*, *Senāsanapaññāpaka*, *Ārāmikapesaka*, *Navakammika*, etc. were the officers in charge of acquisition, distribution and supervision of lodging places.

Besides the knowledge of the department concerned, the qualification which the officers must possess was that they must be impartial.

Saṅgha-kammas and their Execution : The laws by which the early Buddhist Order was governed were framed on scientific and democratic lines. Monks were granted very little personal authority. And even the personal authority given to a monk was to be exercised in corroboration with a duly constituted assembly.

The act of inflicting punishment on a guily monk, the act of initiation (*pabbajjā*), or the like was termed a *saṅgha-kamma* (ecclesiastical act or a transaction of the order), an act or a transaction to be disposed of by an assembly constituted lawfully.

A lawful and complete assembly comprised of all monks residing in the district (*sīmā*) of an *āvāsa* (residence) leaving the *sāmaṇeras*, monks belonging to another *āvāsa* and monks undergoing some sort of punishment.[1] Finally the minimum number of monks required for the transaction of an ecclesiastical act was fixed, the minimum being four and the maximum twenty and above.[2] A motion (*ñatti*), a proclamation (*anussāvanā*) and a resolution (*dhāraṇā*) followed one after another in course of the disposal of an ecclesiastical act lawfully.

The various sorts of ecclesiastical acts (*saṅgha-kammas*) often referred to in the *Vinayapiṭaka* may be grouped as below : (a) Non-disciplinary and non-disputatious *saṅgha-kammas* (b) Disciplinary *saṅgha-kammas*, i. e. offences and punishments, and (c) Ecclesiastical disputes (*adhikaraṇa*).

So far as the transaction of the ecclesiastical acts comprising the first group is concerned, the act of ordination of a candidate stated in brief on pages 40-41 and discussed in detail in the section 'Pabbajjā and Upasampada' belonging to the first chapter, may be cited as an example in point.

The second category, i. e., the disciplinary *saṅgha kammas* comprised of appropriate punishments and penalties accruing from offences incurred by a monk or a nun. Such offences classified in eight groups, namely, (i) *pārājika* (expulsion), (ii) *saṅghādisesa* (suspension), (iii) *nisaggiyā* (forfeiture), (iv) *pācittiyā* (expiation), (v) *aniyatā* (suspension or expiation), (vi) *pāṭidesaniyā* (confession), (vii) *sekhiyā* (rules of training and tutelage) and (viii) *adhikaraṇasamathā* (ways of settling disputes) were 227 for monks and 311 for nuns, enumerated in a separate text known as the *Pātimokkha*. In fact the number of the offences and their punishments should be less than those reffered to.[3]

The different measures carried out against a transgressor for the imposition of the punishments accruing from his offences has been given in great detail in the *Cullavagga*. So also the measures taken for the ecclesiastical acts falling under the third group, the settlement of disputes. As these will find a detailed discussion in the section entiled 'the laws of polity' comprising the fourth chapter, we may postpone their further elaboration here.

---

1. *MV*, 10. 1. 5, pp. 371-72.
2. Ibid, 9. 4. 9-13, pp. 334f; *CV* 1. 1. 5, p. 7-9.
3. Vide *Infra* the last section of the fourth chapter.

SECTION II

(B) THE BACKGROUND OF THE BUDDHIST VINAYA

(a) Pre-Buddhist Beliefs and Practices

The Pāli texts throw a flood of light on religious beliefs and practices which were in vogue in India just before the advent of the Buddha. They are further corroborated by the Brahmaṇical and Jaina sources as well. In the proposed section it is not intended to work out all the details as the only concern here is to point out the circumstances which were instrumental in the origin of the Buddhist Church, specially the rules of *Vinaya*.

An analysis of the doctrines professed by different teachers of the time instantaneously lead us to remark that out of the six types of thought advocated by the six heretical teachers, only two doctrines, *viz*, *Akriyāvāda* and *Kriyāvāda* were more popular than the rest. The teacher and the leader of the former was Ajitakesakambala while that of the latter Niganṭhanāṭaputta.[1]

According to the *Akriyāvādins* or subsequently known as the *Lokāyatas*, a living being is constituted of the four *mahābhutas* (elements), *viz*., earth, water, air and fire, and space (*ākāsa*). After the death of the being, all the elements take their respective original form and the sense organs pass into space. The sum total of the whole teaching is that there is no life after death and hence it is futile to perform sacrifices and practise austerities.[2]

Besides, this attitude of the *Lokāyatas* is confirmed by the Jaina and the Brahmaṇical sources as well. *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*, the second *Aṅga* of the Jaina canon, remarks that the Materialists (*Lokāyatas*) indentify the soul with the body. An action whether good or bad is, therefore, alike to these believers of no world beyond. As such they make every effort to enjoy worldly pleasures to their heart's content.[3]

Among the various Brahmaṇical texts which refer to the *Akriyāvādins*, i.e, the Materialists, the passages contained by the *Sarvasiddhā*-

---

[1] Mahāvīra is called Niganṭhanāṭaputta in Pāli canon. The remaining four teachers were Pūraṇakassapa, Makkhaligosāla, Pakudhakaccāyaṇa and Sañjayabelaṭṭhaputta—Vide *DN*, Vol I, pp. 45-52.

[2] *DN*, Vol. I, p. 48.

[3] *Suyg* (*SBE* Vol. XLV), p. 341.

ntasaṅgraha and *Bhagavatagītā* are of much use for us as the former fully agrees with Ajita's teachings of disintegration of body after death, denunciation of rebirth and inoperativeness of good and bad activities[1], while the latter with the *Sūtrakṛtāṅga's* view that the sole aim of the Materialists is to enjoy life.[2]

Among the *Kriyāvādins* the *Nigaṇṭhanāṭaputtiya samaṇas* and the Jaṭilas[3] deserve attention. According to the Nigaṇṭha (Jaina) philosophy, the highest bliss can be attained only by eliminating the effects of past *karmas* (*nirjarā*), either good or bad, and by checking the influx of new *karmas* (*saṁvara*).[4] The only means to this end, as the Nigaṇṭhas hold, is to perform rigorous ascetic practices. This is why the Nigaṇṭhas lay utmost emphasis on self-control and self-torture. In support of the self-torture, the Nigaṇṭhas are referred to have argued with the Buddha in the following terms at one place in the *Nikāyas*[5] "Now, reverend Gotama, happiness is not to be achieved through happiness, happiness is to be achieved through pain. If, reverend Gotama, happiness were to be achieved through happiness, king Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha could achieve happiness, king Seniya Bimbisāra of Magadha would be more of a dweller in happiness than the venerable Gotama". In fact, the argument is unquestionable and convincing.

Self-restraint practised by the Jaina monks is, according to the *Sāmaññaphalasutta*,[6] fourfold (*cātuyāma-saṁvara*), namely, restraint as regards all (living) water, restraint as regards all evil, getting rid of all evil and being suffused with (self-restraint and) the sense of evil (or who has realised complete self-restraint). According to another interpretation it simply represents the four main characteristics of a Jaina recluse—(1) that he should be free from passion and desire;

---

[1] lokūyatikapakṣe tu tattvaṁ bhūtacatuṣṭayaṁ /
pṛthivyāpastathā tejo vāyurityeva nāparaṁ //

... ...

...deha evātmā na tatoanyo vilakṣṇaḥ /
ihalokāta paro nānyaḥ svargo sti narako na ca /

... ...

tapobhirupavāsādyairmūdha eva praśuṣyati //—*Op. Cit.*, pp. 5-6.

[2] kāmopabhogaparamā etāvaditi niścitāḥ—*Op. Cit.*, 16. 11.

[3] Cf. kammavādino etc, bhikkhave, kiriyavādino-*MV*, 1. 30. 87, p. 76.

[4] *MN*, Vol. I, p. 128.

[5] Ibid, p. 129.

[6] idha, mahārāja, nigaṇṭho sabbavārivārito ca hoti, sabbavāriyutto ca, sabbavāridhuto ca, sabbavāriphuṭo ca. evaṁ kho, mahārāja, nigaṇṭho cātuyāmasaṁvarasaṁvuto hoti.—*DN*, Vol. I, p. 50.

(2) that he should keep himself aloof from all types of traffic; (3) that he should get rid of all *pariggahas* (ideas of possession); and (4) that he should remain absorbed in knowledge and meditation of self.[1] It is the practice of this 'fourfold self-restraint' that makes a recluse '*gatatta*' (whose self has attained the aim) and '*yatatta*' (whose self has been subdued [2].

A major portion of the ascetic practices which are alleged by Kassapa[3], the naked ascetic to have been practised by non-Brahmaṇical ascetics are clearly Jaina. For example, the practice of nudity, plucking out hair and beard, and several other austerities to be observed in respect of food, dress and bed, etc. are the essential features of Jaina discipline.

Thus before the advent of the Buddha, there were non-Brahmaṇical religious teachers and leaders who placed hedonism above asceticism, and asceticism above hedonism. The Brahmins, on the other hand, invented an altogether different way of attaining salvation. It was by performing sacrifices and religious rites. As such they practised asceticism inasmuch as it was necessary for their performance of sacrifices and religious rites.[4] There were also others who practised asceticism with great rigour and severity.[5]

(b) Buddhist Standpoint

When India was experiencing a tug of war between hedonism on the one hand and asceticism on the other, the appearance of the Buddha wrought a great change in the religious field of India. Though born as a prince, Lord Buddha had inherent disliking for pleasures of the senses and no mundane pleasure could satisfy him. On the contrary, it proved disgusting to him, for the stark reality of the world that a being; whether big or small, rich or poor; is subject to disease, old-age and death; in brief; to sufferings of various descriptions; could not escape from his eyes. This made him adopt ascetic life and throw himself heart and soul into the practice of austerity which was the usual way. But that too in course of time failed to satisfy him and he realised that extreme self-mortification resulted in loss of health and mental powers.

---

1. *Mahāvīra*, pp. 13-14.
2. Ibid.
3. Vide *DN*, Vol. I, *Mahāsīhanādasutta*.
4. *EMB*, Vol. I, p. 17.
5. *Mahābhārata*, *Śāntiparva* and *Anuśāsanaparva*.

Thus his personal experience as a prince on the one hand and as an ascetic on the other led him to believe that neither of the two ways of life could give the highest bliss. His disgust for the two extremes can be seen in his First Sermon delivered to the Pañcavaggiya monks where he dubbed them as two extremes, the former being 'low, ignoble, for worldlings, unworthy and unprofitable,' while the latter 'painful, unworthy and unprofitable'[1].

The greatest benefit which the Buddha derived from his previous experiences was that he adopted the middle path, a course between the so-called two extremes. This doctrine of *Majjhimāpaṭipadā* is established most successfully in an episode of the *Mahāvagga* which runs as below :

In his earnestness to realise the truth, Soṇakolivisa, just after his conversion, exerted himself so much so that his feet blistered and started bleeding. When the Buddha came to know of it, he scolded him and explained the ineffectiveness of too much rigourism by a simile of a lute. He asked Soṇakolivisa whether he would be able to play on a lute whose strings are either too taut or too slack. Soṇakolivisa replied in the negative. Then again the Buddha inquired of Soṇakolivisa whether he would be able to play on a lute whose strings are neither too taut nor too slack, but stretched evenly. This time Soṇakolivisa replied in the affirmative. "In the same way, the Buddha proclaimed, too much application of energy conduce to restlessness, while too weak an application to slothfulness. Therefore, Soṇa, exert yourself evenly, apply your faculty steadfastly. Let that be the object of your exertion."[2]

Now what turns out is that the nature of the *Vinaya* laws should essentially be a reconciliation between the two extremes of sensuality and self-mortification. But a study of the *Vinaya* laws, however, gives an altogether different impression. They seem to echo the laws of the ascetics. In this connection it is worth while to refer to the *nissayas* or the original sources of maintenance allowed to the Bundhist monks and the *dhutaṅgas* implied by them. The first of the four *nissayas* was *piṇḍiyālopabhojana* which asked a monk to rely only on begging not only for his provisions but practically for all his needs. The second was *paṁsukūlacīvara* which prescribed robes prepared only from rags taken from dust-heaps in the villages and cemeteries. The third was *rukkhamūlasenāsana* which demanded that a monk should take recourse only to the foot of a tree as his shelter. According to the last *nissaya*, the *pūtimuttabhesajja*, a monk should use only urine as his medicine.[1]

---

[1] *MV*, 1. 7. 13, p. 13.
[2] Ibid,, 5. 2. 5, p. 202.

A number of monks, who wanted to lead particularly a strict monastic life adhered to these laws. Others, on the other hand, revolted against them. The *Mahāvagga* tells of a newly admitted monk, previously a Brahmin, who when asked by the monks to beg, not only refused to obey them but also warned them to desert the fold if not supplied with provisions "*nāhaṁ, āvuso. etaṁ kāraṇā pabbajito piṇḍāya carissāmī ti. sace me dassatha bhuñjissāmi, no ce me dassatha vibbhamissāmī ti*"[2]. Then again the same text speaks of a youth who came to the monks and requested them for admission. The monks told him the four resources before his admission, whereupon he expressed his inability to receive *pabbajjā* as the requisites were disagreeable to him : "*sace me, bhante, pabbajite nissaye ācikkheyyātha, abhirameyyāmahaṁ. na dānāhaṁ, bhante, pabbajissāmi; jegucchā me nissayā paṭikūlā ti*"[3].

Obviously the main purpose of the regulations was extreme poverty. It allowed no private property at all. The possession of money was strictly forbidden right from the very inception of the Church, which continued as a point of controversy for a pretty long time.[4] Besides, they were unwholesome and revolting too. For example, a number of rules like picking up rags from cemeteries and several other rules regarding other resources are named 'unsanitary rules' by an eminent orientalist, Mr. E. A. Reed.[5]

These practices of the early Buddhists appear to have a close resemblance with that of the Jaina monks who not only persisted in houselessness strictly, but also starved their bodies in want of proper food and clothing. Later on though the severity of the rules seems to have been relaxed as the *Vinayapiṭaka* speaks of accepting donations, attending invitations and using even storeyed building as dwelling places[6] by the monks, yet a monk was strictly advised to be satisfied only with "sufficient robes to cherish his body, with sufficient food to keep his stomach going" so that "whithersoever he may go forth these things he takes with him as he goes—just as a bird with wings, withersoever he may fly, carries his wings with him as he flies".[1] Thus a monk could possess utmost a set of three robes, an alms-bowl, a needle, a rosary, a razor and a strainer only.[2]

---

[1] *MV*, 1. 22. 73, p. 55.

[2] *Op. cit* 1. 22. 73, p. 55.

[3] *MV*, 1. 23. 74, p. 74.

[4] The possession of *jātaruparajata* was one of the ten contentions which were settled in the second Buddhist Council. Vide *CV*, 12. 2. 13, p. 423.

[5] *Primitive Buddhism*, pp. 138-42.

[6] *MV*, 1. 22. 73 (p. 55); 1. 69. 128 (p. 100); *CV*, 6. 12.32 (p. 272).

(c) The Concession Allowed to the Ascetics

In fact the Buddhist Order was an assemblage of renegades and apostates, who came from different sects and schools and joined the Buddhist Church. Some of them, although they adopted the new faith by abandoning the old ones, could not resist the temptation for their previous faiths. Thus the Chavaggiya monks who may be regarded as a symbol of the Lokāyatas, i e. the Materialists were always in the look out for finding some way out of the severity of the Vinaya rules. It was simply because they dared not pressing their demand for an easy-going life to the Buddha as they knew it well that their mission would not be adored with success. At the same time it should be borne in mind that their elusion was nothing but a mild revolt against the severity of the Vinaya rules.

Opposed to them were the ascetics on whose bones the foundation of the Buddhist Order had been laid. The first converts of the Buddhist faith, the Pañcavaggiya monks were none but the Brahmaṇical ascetics. So also were the Kassapa brothers and a host of others. They were, no doubt, in minority, but still dominated over the Order. Once a monk who might have belonged to or have been influenced by ascetic ideals came to the Buddha and requested him to introduce nakedness into the Order.[3] Next to him Buddha's cousin Devadatta who was very likely a Jaina-minded monk took the lead. He approached the Buddha boldly with his five propositions that forest-dwelling, relying on food received only in begging-tours wearing clothes made of rags taken from dust-heaps, living at the root of a tree and complete abstinence from fish and meat should be made compulsory.[4] When he came to know that his demand was not going to be fulfilled, he raised a schism in the Buddhist Order on the ground that Buddha's teaching was conducive to luxury.[5] This led the Buddha to realise that it was not the voice of an individual, but of 'a large and influential minority'.[6] Their strong leaning towards ascetic

---

1. *Dialogues of the Bnddha*, Vol. I, p. 81.
2. Vide *Supra*, p. 44, fn. 2.
3. *MV*. 8. 24. 45, pp. 319-20.
4. *CV*, 7. 9. 14, pp. 297-300.
5. Ibid., p. 299, Cf *samaṇo pana gotamo bāhulliko bāhullāya ceteti*.
6. *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Vol. I, pp. 218-19.

practices constrained him to make allowance for those who were inclined that way.

Thus the *dhutaṅgas*, though we neither find the Buddha superseding Devadatta's demand by any other precepts nor we come across any reference to the *dhutaṅgas* either in the *Nikāyas* or in the *Vinaya* texts, was most probably the concession granted to those who were in favour of rigorous ascetic practices. There is reason for such a remark. Devadatta's proposals[1] were, as a matter of fact, pertaining to

(a) food
i. *piṇḍapātikā assu* (let the monks depend on alms),
ii. *macchamaṁsaṁ na khādeyyuṁ* (let the monks not take fish and meat);
(b) dress
iii. *paṁsukūlikā assu* (let the monks wear rags);
& (c) dwelling
iv. *āraññikā assu* (let the monks be forest-dweller), &
v. *rukkhamūlikā assu* (let the monks live at the foot of a tree).

The *dhutaṅgas*[2] which are thirteen in number, too, were special vows regarding the same three needs of monastic life, *viz.*,

(a) food
i. *piṇḍapātikaṅgaṁ*—to eat food procured by begging only,
ii. *sapadānacārikaṅgaṁ*—to beg alms from door to door without any omission,
iii. *ekāsanikaṅgaṁ*—to take meal at one sitting only,
iv. *pattapiṇḍikaṅgaṁ*—to eat from one vessel only,
v. *khalupacchābhattikaṅgaṁ*—not to take meal after finishing meal;
(b) dress
vi. *paṁsukūlikaṅgaṁ*—to use robes made of rags taken from dust-heaps,
vii. *tecīvarikaṅgaṁ*—to use not more than three robes;
& (c) dwelling
viii. *āraññikaṅgaṁ*—to dwell only in forests,
ix. *rukkhamūlikaṅgaṁ*—to live at the foot of a tree,
x. *abbhokāsikaṅgaṁ*—to live in open sky,
xi. *sosānikaṅgaṁ*—to live in a cemetery,
xii. *yathāsanthatikaṅgaṁ*—to use whatever bed or seat is available and
xiii. *nesajjikaṅgaṁ*—to spend night sitting and not lying.

---

[1] *CV*, 7. 9. 14, pp 297-300.
[2] Vide *Visuddhimaggo*, Dhutaṅganiddeso; *Milindapañho*, Dhutaṅgakathā.

Now it is clear that the five propositions of Devadatta and the *dhutaṅgas*, both of which fundamentally correspond to the four *nissayas* which also pertain to

(a) food	i. *piṇḍiyālopabhojanaṁ*—to use food received in begging only,
	ii. *pūtimuttabhesajjaṁ*—to use stinking-urine as medicine;
(b) dress	iii. *paṁsukūlacīvaraṁ*—to wear robes made of rags taken from dust-heaps and
& (c) dwelling	iv. *rukkhamūlasenāsanaṁ*—to live under the foot of a tree,

were virtually uniform. If it was so, then the question as to what was the reason which persuaded the Buddha to refuse Devadatta's appeal naturally comes to the fore. The main difficulty which the Buddha might have envisaged in acceding to the latter's proposal was perhaps that it was nothing but a retreat to the severity of the *nissayas* which had already been abrogated by sanctioning *atirekalābha* (extra-gain). But the strong protest lodged by Devadatta and his following might have compelled the Master to accord a partial sanction to the *dhutaṅgas* for those monks who were inclined to them.

These rules and many other regulations of the Order are either identical with or bear a close resemblance to those which were in vogue among other sects of ascetics before the Buddha. But on that account they cannot be regarded as exact replica of the ascetic laws. It is true that the Buddha borrowed some practices and customs for his Order from the existing stock. But at the same time it is also a fact that whatever he borrowed, he borrowed on experiment basis. It is because of this that a major portion of the rules are marked by three stages of evolution, adjustment and adoption or abrogation. For instance the rules of *nissayas*, already noted, were originally promulgated with the same severity as they were being practised by the other sects of ascetics. But no sooner their severity was perceived than they were relaxed. This tendency from severe to less severe is almost patent throughout the whole regulations of the Order. Thus the history of the origin of the Buddhist *Vinaya* is the history of the reform of the extremist tendency of the rules of the ascetics which was left open with the express permission of the Master to do away with the lesser and minor precepts, if the Church so desired.[1]

---

[1] **ākaṅkhamāno, Ānanda, Saṅgho mamaccayena khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni samuhanatu.** *DN*, **Vol. II, p. 118.**

CHAPTER II

THE ORDER : FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Section I

Pabbajjā and Upasampadā

Section II

Nissayas

SECTION I

PABBAJJĀ AND UPASAMPADĀ

(a) Pabbajjā and Upasampadā Connotated

'*Pabbajjā*'[1] (Skt. *pravrajyā* and Pkt. *pavvajjā*) truly speaking is a very ancient term of Indian monachism. So is '*upasampadā*' or '*uvaṭṭhāvaṇā*'. The literal meaning of the term *pabbajjā* is 'to renounce the household life and to go forth into houseless state.'[2] Thus it can safely be said that *pabbajjā* originally implied to join a religious order may it be Brahmaṇical, Jaina, Buddhist or any other. Similarly *upasampadā* means the recognition of the admitted (*pabbajita*) as a duly qualified member of the sect or school joined by the candidate. But it should be borne in mind that every Indian religious organisation adopted these terms according to its own convenience and suitability, and so it modified and limited their connotation and scope accordingly.

Thus the act of admission into any religious institution is termed *pabbajjā* and its confirmation *upasampadā*. But as already stated, no sooner than the Buddhists adopted the term *pabbajjā*, they limited its scope. So Prof. Oldenberg aptly remarks that 'the *pabbajjā* is the going out from a prior state, from the lay-life or from a monastic sect holding another faith'.[3] In one word, *pabbajjā*, to the Buddhists, stands for taking upon the life of a Buddhist friar. Similarly *upasampadā* means 'extra or exceeding gain'[4], that is the gain of being confirmed as a fully accredited member of the Buddhist Order. The confirmation of a monk or a nun is so termed, for no sooner he or she is ordained than is allowed to avail all the privileges belonging to the Order.

More or less the same is true of the Jaina Order also as it holds that '*pavvajjā* is going out (*pavvayaṇaṁ*) from sin (i.e. sinful activities) to the activity of pure conduct, i.e. to join the Jaina Order by giving

---

1. *Nikkhamaṇa*, *cāga* and *dikkhā*, etc. are often referred to as synonyms of *pabbajjā*.
2. Cf. 'kulaputtā sammadeva agārasmā anagāriyaṁ pabbajjanti', and 'samaṇassa aṁtie muṁḍe bhavittā agārāo aṇagāriyaṁ pavvaissai'.
3. Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 347.
4. 'From this time he is regarded as an *upasampa* (i. e. *upasampanna*) from *upa*, exceeding, and *sampada*, gain, advantage'–Prof. Hardy, *Eastern Monachism*, p. 45.

up domestic state or any other monastic career'.[1] The confirmation of this formal admission is styled *uvaṭṭhāvaṇā* (Skt. *upasthāpa nā*), i.e. to admit the initiated to the privileges of the recognised monk.[2]

It is an admitted fact that scholars differ so far as the interpretation of the terms *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* is concerned. To dialate upon those details, therefore, would simply be beating about the bush, for in some form or other they give the same result. Anyhow we should take note of Prof. Oldenberg's interpretation of the terms which seem to be more appropriate when he calls the former, i.e. *pabbajjā*, 'lower initiation' and the latter, i.e *upasampadā*, 'higher initiation'[3] most probably having in view the difference in amount of privileges availed at these two successive stages. That *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* are the two distinct gradual stages of the life of a Buddhist friar is also corroborated by Prof. Kern in spite of his confusing remark that 'if we descend into the details the matter becomes embarrassing' which he himself refutes to a great extent, if not completely.[4] His confusion seems to be due to the fact that in some cases the grounds 'for separating the two steps of initiation' are not distinct. But we should note that in such cases initiation (*pabbajjā*) and ordination (*upasampadā*) were conferred simultaneously.[5] Not only this, but several persons are also referred to have realised the truth as soon as they were admonished by the Blessed One or his disciples.[6]

So far as this distinction between *pavvajjā* and *uvaṭṭhāvaṇā* is concerned the Jaina Order seems to be more strict than the Buddhist as it still retains it. Even nowadays, the Jaina Order calls these two stages of *pavvajjā* and *uvaṭṭhāvaṇā* as '*choṭi dikṣā*' (minor or primary initiation) and '*baḍīdīkṣā*' (major or final initiation) respectively, very likely on account of the same reason which led Prof. Oldenberg to style them as 'lower' and 'higher' initiation respectively.

Now it is indubitable that initiation and ordination are the two distinct successive stages of the life of a Buddhist monk as well as of a Jaina monk. Thus the remark passed with regard to the Buddhist Order that 'we should not confuse them as two different orders' (opposed to two distinct stages) 'of the Buddhist monastic life[7]' is applicable to the Jaina Order as well.

---

[1] *Pañcavastukagrantha*, 1. 5.

[2] Vide *HJM*, 216.

[3] Oldenberg, *Buddha*, *p*. 347.

[4] Prof. Hardy, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 76.

[5] Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 347.

[6] Vide *MV*, 1.7.13-19, pp. 13-16; 1.9.25-26, pp. 18-19; 1.17.60-62, pp. 38-41; etc.

[7] Prof. Hardy, *Eastern Monachism*, pp. 45 f.

So there were certain qualifications without which nobody could aspire for *upasampadā*. Ordinarily *upasampadā* could not be conferred upon a person of less than twenty years of age.[1] Besides, the novice had also to train himself in the *dhammas* and to show a high moral standard. Particularly the candidates previously belonging to different religious sects had to undergo a preliminary course of training called *parivāsa* extending over four months prior to his ordination,[2] which was waved in the case of Jaṭilas.[3]

The Jaina Church was not less strict than the Buddhist. A novice had to observe the five great vows and other precepts of monastic etiquette for a period of six months at the maximum, four months on an average and a week for the minimum.[4]

It may however be noted that in the beginning there was only a subjective criterion, *viz.* to satisfy the *ācārya* and the *upādhyāya* by one's conduct. These two officers who were the sole authorities to promote a neophyte to the rank of a full-fledged member of the order must ordain as soon as they found a person fit and capable. Sometimes, it so happened that the *ācārya* and the *upādhyāya*, out of jealousy, etc., delayed the ordination purposely. It was in order to avoid this coflict between the teacher and the pupil that some practical lessons such as committing certain texts, etc.—*Dhammapada* in Buddhism and *Dasaveāliya* in Jainism—to the memory, was prescribed, having mastered which anybody could claim his ordination.

Was Buddha ordained ?—is a significant question to be posed by any one. It is to be noted that the Buddha's ordination coincided with his attainment of omniscience under the Bodhi tree. That Tathāgatas are not ordained by others is the only difference between Tathāgatas' ordination and that of ordinary persons.[5] When asked by Upaka, an Ājīvikan monk as to who was his teacher, the Buddha replied that he had no teacher.[6] So Prof. Oldenberg rightly points out that Buddha's departure from home is distinct from the *upasampadā*, the attainment of delivering knowledge.[7]

The same is true of the Tīrthaṅkaras. None of them is reported to have been initiated or ordained by anybody else. Mahāvīra, the

---

1. *MV*, 1. 67. 124, p. 97.
2. Ibid, 1. 30. 86-87, pp. 73-76.
3. Ibid, 1.30.86-87, pp. 73-76.
4. *Vav*, 10. 15.
5. *Milindapañho*, p. 79.
6. *MV*, 1. 6. 11, p. 11.
7. Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 347.

last in the list of twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras, is said to have embraced mendicant life under the Aśoka tree in Saḍavana of the Ṇāṭa clan[1] and to have attained the supreme knowledge, *mokṣa* under a Sāla tree on the bank of the river Rājupālikā without anybody's help[2]. These two occasions, as already stated in case of the Buddha, may be taken as his initiation and ordination respectively. Thus both the Buddha and the Mahāvīra attained their highest goal independently.

On the contrary, there are evidences which are in direct contradistinction to the above fact. We are told that the Buddha, at first, not only joined the Orders of Alārakālāma and Uddakarāmaputta, but also conducted himself in accordance with their customs. So did the Mahāvīra by conforming to the strict discipline of Pārśvanātha. Still, neither a Buddhist nor a Jaina would forbear to admit that either a Tathāgata or a Tīrthankara "could have belonged to an Order even for ever so-short a time".[3]

(b) The Process of Admission

(i) Conversion of monks

The Buddha, when he attained the truth, was not at all inclined to preach it to the people as he regarded them ignorant and incapable of understanding it. However, Brahmā Sahampati's request to take a sympathetic attitude at least towards those who were mentally more vigilant made the Buddha inclined to give his message to the world.[4] In the beginning of his career as a religious preacher, he felt the least necessity of any ceremony, formal or informal, to be performed when converting a person. The well-known Pañcavaggiyas, Buddha's five quondam friends were the most fortunate who sought admission into the Order first simply by the words :

"Sir, let us receive *pabbajjā* in your presence" and were received by the Master into the Order by the words : "Come, O monks, well-said is the doctrine, consecrate your life for the complete destruction of suffering"[5].

This is recorded as the earliest and at the same time a complete procedure of admission into the Order. Next to the Pañcavaggiyas

---

1. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 259.
2. Ibid, p. 263.
3. Stevenson, *Heart of Jainism*, p. 33.
4. *MV*, 1. 5. 7-9, pp. 6-10.
5. "labheyyāma mayaṁ, bhante bhagavato santike pabbajjaṁ labheyyāma upasampadaṁ" ti."etha bhikkhavo" ti bhagavā avoca svākkhāto dhammo caratha brahmacariyaṁ sammā dukkhassa antakiriyāyā" ti. sā va tesaṁ āyasmantānaṁ upasampadā ahosi *MV*, 1.7.19, pp. 15f.

to be received into the Order by the same formula were Yasa and his fifty-four other friends who attained Arhatahood no sooner than they were admonished by the Teacher.

Besides the Buddha himself, now there were sixty Arhantas in all in the world who were despatched by the Teacher to different corners of the country with a view to propagate the Dhamma to the general mass. Very soon they brought a large number of candidates who were ready to take upon themselves the monastic career. As such it became impractical for the Teacher alone to receive all such candidates into the Order. Naturally, monks were permitted to confer initiation and ordination upon such candidates and a process of admission known as *tisaraṇagamana* formula was laid down so that the monks might not be inconvenienced in any way The same may be summed up as below :

"One, who is to be received into the Saṅgha, should get his hair and beard saved, put on saffron-robes, adjust his upper robe so as to cover one shoulder, salute the feet of the monks and sit down squatting. Then with folded hands he should utter thrice :

"I take the Buddha as my refuge,
I take the Dhamma as my refuge,
I take the Saṅgha as my refuge'."[1]

This procedure regarding initiation and ordination, as a rule, was to be followed by everyone when converting a candidate. But the Buddha himself is recorded as an exception to it, for he converted the Bhaddavaggiyas, the Jaṭilas, Sāriputta, Moggallāna and several others as full-fledged members of the Saṅgha by the old formula—'*ehi bhikkhu*'—even though the new procedure had already been set forth by him.

In due course, the preceding procedure too was replaced by a new one known as *ñatticatutthakammaupasampadā*.[2] According to the new rule, an announcement, that such and such a person wishes to receive *upasampadā* with Venerable such and such as his *upajjhāya* (preceptor), was to be made before a seated assembly of monks. The announcement or motion (*ñatti*) was taken to be approved, if the Order remained silent. The procedure was completed with the resolution that *upasampadā* had been conferred on such and such a person with Venerable such and such as his *upajjhāya*, put three times to the Sangha.

---

[1] *MV*, 1. 11. 34, pp. 23-24.

[2] This question or motion is put once or three times, in the first case, we have a *ñattidutiyakamma* (as in the case of fixation of boundary of an *āvāsa* (at *MV*, 2. 4. 7-9, p. 109); in the second case, a *ñatticatutthakamma* (as in this case).—Vide *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (*SBE*. Vol. XII), p. 170, fn 2.

This procedure was again supplemented with some alteration and addition to it, and thus was given the final shape. In order to make it easily intelligible let us confer *upasampadā* on a person, say Mr. X for the sake of convenience.

The ordinary rule to conduct the ordination ceremony of a person required a Saṅgha of not less than ten persons[1], and all of them must be exceptionally qualified and experienced[2]. Specially two persons, one to act as the instructor (*anusāsaka*) and the other as preceptor (*upajjhāya*) must be duly appointed by the Saṅgha so that the function may be solemnised lawfully. Let them be called Venerable B and A respectively.

Now the actual proceeding begins :

Ven. B, the instructor should instruct aside Mr. X, the monk-to-be (*upasampadāpekkhā*) about the bars to admission, robes, alms-bowl, the process of choosing his preceptor and the nature of questions to be asked (by him) before the assembly. Then he should ask him to reply frankly and boldly when examined about the disqualifications. Having so instructed, Venerable B should take permission on Mr. X's behalf to come before the assembly. If permitted, he should come to the assembly with Mr. X and should cause him to request the assembly in the following words :

"Sirs, I (Mr. X) request the assembly for *upasampadā*. May I be, Sirs, saved by the assembly having compassion on me."

Then a qualified and capable monk having inquired of Mr. X about the five incurable diseases, his sex, debt, his warfare, his parents' consent, his age and his preceptor's name, etc. before the assembly, should lay the following motion :

"Listen to me, Sirs, Mr. X prays for *upasampadā* from Venerable A. He is free from the disqualifications *antarāyikadhamma* and duly provided with alms-bowl and robes. Mr.X requests the assembly for *upasampadā* with Venerable A as his *upajjhāya*.

---

[1] *MV* 1. 23. 74. p. 56.

[2] Vide *Infra*, 'The Authority...to carry out the Function'.

Listen to me, Sirs, Mr. X desires *upasampadā* from Venerable A. He is free from the disqualifications and duly provided with alms-bowl and robes. Mr. X requests the assembly for *upasampadā* with Venerable A as his *upajjhāya*. The Saṅgha ordains Mr. X with Venerable A as his *upajjhāya*. Those who approve should keep silence and those who do not, should speak.

The Saṅgha has ordained Mr. X with Venerable A as his *upajjhāya*. The Saṅgha approves it, therefore it is silent."[1]

Thereto, the procedure is virtually completed.

Thereafter, the whole formula *(saṅgīti)* which mentions the season, date and the accurate time of conversion should be repeated to him so that he might estimate his spiritual age correctly. Lastly the four resources *(nissaya)* should be told.[2]

The Jaina sources, on the other hand, attribute a long tradition of twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras to the Jaina Order. But at the very outset, it may be pointed out that they, though elaborate, do not trace as a gradual and systematic origin and development of the Jaina monastic system in general and that of the process of initiation and ordination in particular as the Buddhist sources do in its own case. It is, therefore, difficult to say whether the twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras or any one of them, like the Buddha, considered the inmates of the world ignorant and unworthy of his sermon[3] and denied to reveal it to them on that account. So also, none of the Tīrthaṅkaras is mentioned to have received any person to his fold through a definite process or to have laid down any direct procedure for conferring initiation and ordination.

But despite the fact, there are instances of persons who embraced Jainism in the presence of one or the other Tīrthaṅkara. Mahāvīra, the last in the list of the twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras, is however alleged to have preached his first sermon to the gods but without any effect.[4] The first person to be blessed with the sermon of Mahāvīra was Gautama Indrabhūti and his colleagues among men and Vasumati (Candanabālā) among women.[5] Prominent among those who joined the Order in due course were Megha[1], Sthāpatyāputra[2], Jamālī[3] and several others. The ceremony of their conversion is always described elaborately and are almost similar in all cases. It may, however, be noted that the luxury and pomp of the ceremony varied according to the status of the person wishing to join the order.[4] Our statement will be evidenced by the description of the renunciation of Megha, the prince of Rājagṛha.

---

[1] *MV*, 1, 68. 125-26, pp. 97-99.

[2] Ibid, I. 69. 128, p. 100.

[3] The futility of Mahāvīra's sermon hints to the incapability of the gods to receive it.--*Ṭhān*, 777, p. 523b.

[4] Ibid, 777, p. 523b; Comm. to *Ṭhān*, p. 524a.

[5] *Tīrthaṅkara Vardhamāna*, pp. 51-52.

Just after his coronation, Megha disgusted with worldly life made up his mind to forsake the world and to betake himself to houseless life. His parents, having come to know his determination summoned a barber and ordered him to cut his hair off leaving a small tuft of hair so as to suit the standing custom of renunciation. His mother took the hair in a cloth decked with the figure of swan and preserved them in a jewelled box. Then he was bathed with white and yellow pitchers and was dressed in costly and gorgeous costumes and ornaments.

Then Megha ascended a palanquin adorned luxuriously. His mother too having performed the oblation, sat on his right side and his chief nurse (*ambadhāī*) on the left with broom (*rayaharaṇa*) and alms-bowl (*paḍiggaka*) in their hands. All of them were facing the east. Then friends and relatives of Megha took them to the place called Guṇaśilakacaitya outside the city of Rājagṛha. There, they descended from the palanquin and went to Lord Mahāvīra. The parents of Megha, after perambulating round the Lord thrice, requested him to accept their son as his own disciple as he was fed up with worldly life. The Lord consented to it. Then Megha, going ahead of the Lord in the north-eastern direction stripped himself of all his ornaments and fineries. His mother caught up them in a swan-marked garment. Though overwhelmed with grief, yet she advised him always to be heedful and to strive earnestly in monk life. Then the parents of Megha returned home.

After his parents' departure, Megha himself plucked out his hair in five handfuls and perambulating round the Lord thrice, bowed down to him. Then he, showing disgust with the household life,

---

1. *Nāyā*, pp. 29 34.
2. Ibid, pp 70-72.
3. *Bhag.* 9. 33, pp. 461 ff.
4. Sometimes, not only the expenditure to be incurred on the conversion ceremony was met by the king, but even the entire family of the person renouncing household life was supported by him.—*Nāyā*, pp. 70-72.

requested him to receive himself as his direct disciple in the following words :

> "Therefore, I wish, Sir, to be initiated, to be tonsured, to be instructed, to be admonished, to be trained in the propriety of conduct and to be exhorted by the Lord himself."

Then the Lord himself initiated Megha and preached him religious discourse.[1]

This festive procedure of renunciation followed by the Jainas does not obtain with the Buddhists. But one thing, however, seems certain. It is that the process is to some extent identical with the procedure adopted by the Buddha in case of admitting a person as lay devotee.[2] The final procedure of renunciation recorded by the Canonical texts of the Buddhists is out and out a *saṅgha-kamma*. But it may however be pointed out that this way of admission to the Buddhist Order, as it was devoid of festivity, could not continue for long. In due course it gave way to a process full of pomp and luxury. It is therefore not amazing to know that the Theravādins, even nowadays, solemnise the ceremony with due pomp and eclat.[3] Thus they follow a procedure not very different from that of the Jainas already referred to.

Besides the above procedure of the Jaina initiation, the *Pañcavastuka*, one of the most important non-canonical Jaina texts gives a procedure which in several respects, it will be seen, resembles to the ceremony of initiation or ordination of the Buddhists, already mentioned as *ñatticatutthakammaupasampadā*.

According to this procedure, certain questions pertaining to native place, the status of his family and the motive of renunciation are put to the monk-to-be *(pavvayāveha)* which he is to face boldly and frankly. Then he is made acquainted with the pure conduct of ascetics and the good consequences that are in store for him. So also, he is to be alarmed of the perdition imminent for the feigned ascetics with the example of a sick meeting his end soon due to improper food. Then he is tested formally even if he is considered fit and capable.

After all these preliminaries, the teacher, on an auspicious day, teaches the monk-to-be the formula of paying homage to the *celiyas*

---

1. *Nāyā*, pp. 29-34. It is perhaps only in the *Nāyādhammakahāo* that we find Lord Mahāvīra converting persons himself, in terms analogous with that of the Buddha who is referred to have received a number of persons himself.
2. Cf. *Infra*, pp. 85-6.
3. Vide, P. Levy, *Buddhism*, a 'Mystery Religion' Chap. I-II.

and the *siddhas*, and the way of *sāmāyika*, *pratikramaṇa* and *iriyāpatha*, etc. Then the monk-to-be, after worshiping the *vītarāgas* and revering the *sādhus* by oblation to the extent of his wealth, reveres the *cetiyas*, uproots handfuls of his hair in order to show non-attachment towards the body *(usagga)* and perambulating (round the teacher ?) thrice recites the *sāmāyika* formula. Afterwards, the teacher, having made him seated on his left side, reveres the *cetiyas* along with other monks present there. Then he, after the monk-to-be's request for initiation expressly receiving him as his disciple, gives him the *rayaharaṇa* (duster), taking it from an elevated place and uttering the *maṅgala*.[1]

The Digambara way of becoming a monk was not so complex as that of the Śvetāmbara. A person willing to join the Order approached the *gaṇin*, saluted the five dignitaries, *viz*. the *siddhas*, the *jīnas*, the *ācāryas*, the *upādhyāyas*, and the *sādhus*, and then, after saluting the *gaṇin*, requested him for admission. If permitted, he uprooted his hair and whiskers, bid farewell to his garments and adopted nakedness, This was in brief the process of joining the Digambara Church.[2]

We notice that the striking features of the procedure are inquiry (*pucchā*), instruction (*kahaṇā*), test (*parīcchā*), teaching of *sāmāyika*, etc. and paying oblation to the *cetiyas*, etc. which concur with the *ñatticatutthakammaupasampadā* to a considerable extent. As the *Pañcavastuka* is decidedly a later work, so it is not improbable that we may be misled to think that the propounder either borrowed it or amended the previous one taking the *ñatticatutthakammaupasampadā* as his model. But the plausibility of such misconception is revealed in no time as the very spirit of the Buddhist way of initiation, i. e. the democratic spirit, is not to be traced in it. The difference lies in the fact that the Jaina Order, even though it carries out the procedure in the presence of a good number of monks, it, like the Buddhist, does not deem it necessary to have the sanction of the monks.

(ii) Conversion of nuns

In order to give a proper estimate of the position of women in the Jaina and the Buddhist Orders, it is necessary to give a brief account of their position in religious life and activities before the advent of the Mahāvīra and the Buddha and its impact on them. In this connection it is remarkable to note that women, during the Vedic period, were regarded as much capable as men for persuing religious career. Naturally, not only they are alluded to to have specialised themselves in Vedic studies but also to have taken active interest in the composition of Vedic Hymns. So also, they were deemed no less qualified than men to perform a sacrifice. Specially, sacrifices like the Sītā sacrifice could be performed by women alone. This exalted position of women continued unimpaired down to the end of the Upaniṣadic period as several women like Gārgī and Maitreyī persisted in active religious activities. Not only this, but some of them were discarding the pleasures and prospects of married life in favour of a life of asceticism. Thus it is not at all surprising that nuns existed in Indian society, though in small numbers, even before the rise of Buddhism. But unfortunately, the ascendancy of ascetic school in the post-Upaniṣadic period gradually reduced these privileges of women, and so finally women were placed on the same level with the Śūdras as they were deprived of the right of Vedic studies.[1]

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, I 114-163.

[2] *Pravacanasāra*, 1-7.

Buddhism and Jainism, as they flourished in this period, could not remain altogether unaffected. Thus, though Buddhism accepted that women could attain arhathood, still it declined that they could obtain the Buddhahood as well [2] The Digambara school, one of the two main schools of the Jaina faith, declared that women were not capable of attaining liberation, and hence, it was averse to the admission of women to its Order.[3] The Śvetāmbara school, on the other hand, assigned to women even the highest position of Thīrthaṅkarahood,[4] but at the same time it lowered their position in its Church hierarchy.

The episode regarding the formation of the Buddhist Order of nuns gives the same impression. It is a fact that the Buddha at first was not in favour of the entry of women into his Order. The story as to how he agreed to the formation of the Order of nuns is related thus in the *Cullavagga*.

Once, when the Blessed One was staying in the Nigrodhārāma of Kapilavastu, Mahāprajāpati Gautamī, Buddha's aunt and foster mother, approached him and prayed for the entry of women into the Order. Thrice she prayed for and all the times her request was refused with the same reply—"Enough, O Gautamī, let not please thee that women should be allowed to do so"[1].

---

[1] Adopted from the *Great Women of India*, Vol. I, pp. 26-32.

[2] *MN.* Vol., III, p. 128.

[3] *Pravacanasāra*, 3. 7.

[4] *Viṁśtiviṁśikā*, 19. 8ff. Princess Malli is accepted as the nineteenth Tīrthaṅkara.

Therefrom, the Buddha proceeded to Vaiśālī. Gautamī, too having got her hair cut off and dressed in saffron robes followed him with a band of Sākyan ladies. With swollen feet and tearful eyes, she arrived at Vaiśālī along with her party and waited at the gate of Kuṭāgāra hall where the Blessed One was staying with his disciples. Interviewed with Gautamī, Ānanda promised her to put her case to the Master. Accordingly, he pleaded her cause but with the same effect as in the case of Gautamī noted above. However Ānanda by his convincing and well-reasoned arguments persuaded the Blessed One to give his consent in favour. Thus the Buddha decided to receive Gautamī into the Order on condition that she would conform to the restrictions *(garudhamma)* imposed upon her. Gautamī, though reluctantly, conceded to his proposal that a *bhikkhunī*

i. even if of a long standing, must bow down before a *bhikkhu*, even if just initiated;

ii. in no case, would spend the rainy season in an *āvāsa* (residence) where there was no *bhikkhu*;

iii. in any case, must seek the necessary consultation from the Bhikkhusaṅgha regarding the date of fortnightly meeting (*uposatha*) and exhortation;

iv. after the expiry of the rain-retreat (*vassāvāsa*), must confess her faults, if any, before both the Saṅghas of monks and nuns;

v. in any case, must undergo the *mānatta* punishment towards both the Saṅghas;

vi after the completion of the noviciate would seek the sanction of both the Saṅghas for her ordination;

vii. on no account, would revile a *bhikkhu*;

viii. in no case, could admonish a monk, while a *bhikkhu* could admonish *a bhikkhunī*.[2]

Soon after the conversion of Gautamī, other ladies following her were also received into the Order by the monks, most probably by the same procedure as in the case of the monks alluded to before.[1] Later on the nuns themselves were allowed to confer *pabbajjā* and *upasampadā* on female candidates, but that too was to be approved by the Order of monks. The procedure adopted by both the Saṅghas of monks and nuns to solemnise the conversion of a nun was, no doubt, the same as in the case of a monk.[2]

---

[1] alaṁ, gotami, mā te rucci mātugāmassa tathāgatappaveditassa dhammavinaye agārasmā anagāriyaṁ pabbajjā ti.—*CV*, 10. 1. 1, p. 373.

[2] *CV*, 10. 1-2, pp. 373-77.

Unlike the Buddhists, the beginning of the Jaina Order of nuns can be traced to a period as early as the first Tīrthaṅkara, Ṛṣabha. The *Kalpasūtra* informs us that the following of Ṛṣabha comprised 300000 nuns with Brāhmīsundarī at their head[3]; that of Ariṣṭanemi, the twenty-second Tīrthaṅkara included 40000 nuns under the leadership of Yakṣiṇī[4]; that of Pārśvanātha, the twenty-third Tīrthaṅkara contained 38000 nuns with Puṣpakūlā as their chief[5]; and that of Mahāvīra, the last of the group comprised 36000 nuns with Candanā as their head[6].

This information, however, exaggerated it may be, throws a flood of light at least on the great antiquity of the Jaina Order of nuns. Besides, it also reveals that the Jaina Order of nuns has a distinct feature of its own from the very beginning of the Jaina faith. Yet one thing is remarkable. It is its silence on the point as to how women were allowed to embrace nun-life for the first time The curiousity for an episode parallel to that of the Buddhists is but natural as the Jaina trend of thought, like the Buddhists, was also divided on the issue whether women were worthy of nunhood or not.

Anyway, we come across at various places the descriptions of the renunciation of women which, with some negligible differences in point of their festive element, were not only almost similar in all cases but also corresponded to the practice which obtained with the monks. A brief account of the renunciation of Malli, the nineteenth Tīrthaṅkara of the Śvetāmbara sect will illustrate the case clearly.[7]

Having brought her six suitors to their senses, Malli, the princess of Mithilā asked permission of her parents for renunciation. Her

---

1. *CV*, 10. 3. 3, pp 377-78.
2, Ibid, 10. 10-11, pp. 391-95.
3. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 281.
4. Ibid, p. 278.
5. Ibid, p. 274.
6. Ibid, p. 267.
7. For other instances Vide *Nāyā*, p. 153; *Niryā*, pp. 51-52; 65-66; *Antg*, p. 28.

father king Kumbhaka, having come to know his daugher's determination, arranged a consecration ceremony which was celebrated with due pomp and luxury.

After the consecration ceremony, the king himself decorated and adorned Malli with all sorts of costumes and ornaments. Then the king asked his household servants to prepare a magnificent palanquin which she mounted and sat on the throne facing the east. Then carried both by men and gods, she was brought to the park called Sahaśra Āmravana outside the city of Mithilā, and alighting from the palanquin near the Aśoka tree, took out all her ornaments and fineries which were accepted by her mother Prabhāvati.

Then she plucked out her hair in five handfuls which was received by Śakra, the king of gods. Then she, after saluting the *siddhas*, etc., accepted the life of a nun.[1]

It has already been pointed out that the Jaina Order, unlike the Buddhist, permitted women to enter the Order without any previous undertaking or contract. But it does not mean that it always held women in high esteem. A careful study of the monastic regulations reveals that Jainism vied with Buddhism in assigning an inferior positon to women. Naturally, Buddhism as well as Jainism placed women under a discipline more rigorous than the monks. Not only this, but they aimed even at making a nun in every respect subordinate to a monk. Thus a *bhikkhunī*, how much qualified she may be, cannot become the teacher of male novices.[2] Moreover, the rule that a *bhikkhunī*, even if of a long standing shall make salutation to, shall rise up in presence of, shall bow down before a *bhikkhu*, if only just initiated[3], puts a *bhikkhunī*, of course, lower in position to a monk. Similarly, the rules that a Nigaṇṭha of three years standing can become a teacher of a Nigaṇṭhī of thirty years standing, and that a Nigaṇṭha of five years standing can become *ācārya* of a Nigaṇṭhī of sixty years standing,[4] make a Nigaṇṭhī inferior to a Nigaṇṭha. This subordination of nuns reminds us of the institution of Manu in which a woman is in no case allowed to live an independent life.[5]

---

1. *Nāyā*, pp. 117-20.
2. *CV*, 10. 2. 2. 8, p. 375.
3. Ibid, 10. 2. 2. 1, pp. 374-75.
4. *Vav*, 7. 15-16.
5. *Manu*, 9. 3.

(iii) Conversion of lay disciples

Our assessment of the process of conversion will remain incomplete, if we leave aside the procedure of conversion of lay-disciples as both the Orders, though with varying motives, realised the significance of lay-devotees. In the Buddhist terminology, such members of the faith were called *upāsaka* and *upāsikā*, while in that of the Jaina, they were designated *samaṇopāsaga*, *samaṇopāsigā*, *sāvaga* and *sāvigā* in addition to the designations just referred to in case of the Buddhists. It is a fact that nowhere in the Buddhist texts, lay-devotees are treated as bonafide members of the Order. Consequently, the duties and obligations binding on them are lacking in details. Opposed to this they are considered as a constituent organ of the Jaina Order and accordingly the Jaina monachism always speaks in terms of four orders, *viz.* Samaṇasaṅgha, Samaṇīsaṅgha, Sāvagasaṅgha and Sāvigāsaṅgha.[1]

In spite of the fact just referred to, it is certain that the Buddha received both men and women as lay-disciples. The first men to become life-long lay-disciples by the twofold fomula (*dvevācika*—Buddha and Dhamma) were Tapussa and Bhallika, the renowned merchants of the time. Their conversion took place even before the preaching of the First Sermon in the Deer-park at Ṛṣipatana, the modern Sāranātha. The episode regarding their conversion is stated thus in the *Mahāvagga* :

When the Blessed One was enjoying the Bliss of Emancipation under the Rājāyatana tree, Tapussa and Bhallika came travelling on the road from Ukkala, modern Orissa, to that place. Having been inspired by a god to show their reverence to the Blessed One by offering rice-cake and honey-comb, they approached the Blessed One and saluted him. Then they addressed him thus :

> "May, O Lord, the Blessed One accept from us rice cakes and honey-combs, that this may long be to us for a good and for a blessing".

The Blessed One received the rice-cakes and the honey-combs in the four stone-bowls offered by the four Mahārājā gods. When Tapussa and Bhallika saw that the Blessed One had cleansed his bowls and hands, they bowed to his feet and addressed :

> "We, O Lord, take our refuge in the Lord and in the Dhamma, we may be received, Lord, from henceforth as life-long lay-disciples".

---

[1] *Ṭhān*, 363, p. 281b; cāuvvaṇṇāinne samaṇasaṁghesamaṇā samaṇīo sāviyā sāviyāo. *Bhag*, 580.

Thus they were received as the first lay-disciples in the world.[1]

Yasa's father was the first among men, and his mother and his former wife were the first among women to become life-long lay-disciples, who were converted by the threefold formula soon after the preaching of the First Sermon. The procedure adopted in their case differs entirely from the aforesaid procedure. In other words, it may be said that from henceforth the procedure to receive lay-disciples, both male and female, was given the final shape as below :

> "And in the fore-noon the Blessed One, having put on his under-robes, took his alms-bowl, and, with his robes on, went with venerable such and such as his attendant to the house of such and such, the householder. When he arrived there he sat down on a seat laid out for him. Then such and such the householder bowed down to his feet and sat down near him."

Then the Blessed One preached him in various ways the discourse on giving (*dāna*) and moral (*sīla*), etc When the Blessed One perceived that the mind of such and such a householder was prepared to receive the admonitions properly, then he preached him the principal doctrine of the Buddhas, namely, suffering. the cause of suffering, the cessation of suffering and the path leading to the cessation of suffering.

Consequently, the householder acquired an Insight into the Dhamma, 'whatsoever is an originating thing is also a ceasing thing'. Having realised the Insight, he addressed the Blessed One :

"Glorious Lord, Glorious Lord, just as if one should set up what had been overturned, or should reveal what had been hidden, or should point out the way to one who had lost his way, or should bring a lamp into the darkness, in order that those who had eyes might see visible things, thus has the Blessed One preached the doctrine in many ways. We take our refuge, Lord, in the Blessed One, and in the Dhamma, and in the Order of monks, may the Blessed One receive us from this day forth, while our life lasts, as disciples who have taken their refuge in him".[2]

Now it can be safely said that lay-adherents were received by a fixed procedure which has often been mentioned in the Vinaya and outside.

---

1. *Op. cit.* 1. 4. 6, pp. 5-6.
2. Ibid, 1. 9. 25-29, pp. 18-23.

Like the Buddhist Piṭakas, the Jaina Āgamas too refer to householders embracing Jainism by a similar process which is described in great details. Now we intend to quote a typical example so that the procedure of conversion of lay-disciples may be explicit. Our favour goes to the conversion of Ānanda, a renowned merchant of Vāṇijyagrāma.

Ānanda, on getting the news that Lord Mahāvīra has come to the temple called Dūtipalāsaka, outside the city of Vāṇijyagrāma, decided to pay a visit to him as association with the Blessed One was considered meritorious. Dressed in costly costumes and fineries, he came out of his own house on foot followed by a train of men holding a luxurious umbrella over him. Coming to the Lord, he bowed down to him perambulating round him thrice.

Then the Lord preached a religious discourse. Having been excited by the religious discourse of the Lord, Ānanda said :

> "I have faith, O Lord, in the doctrines of the Nigaṇṭha; I trust, O Lord, the law of the Nigaṇṭha; I believe, O Lord, the religion of the Nigaṇṭha; it is, O Lord, true; it is, O Lord, right; it is, O Lord, not false that I do accept as has been preached by you; but I am not able to accept monk life in the manner in which many kings, etc., having got themselves shaved, renounced the household life and took initiation at your hands. I accept, O Lord, the religion comprising the twelvefold duties of a Jaina *upāsaka* (*duvālasavihaṁgihidhammaṁ*), *viz*, the five Minor vows (*pañcāṇuvvaiyaṁ*) and the seven Disciplinary vows (*sattasikkhāvvaiyaṁ*). As it pleases you, O Lord, I should not be debarred from it".

Thus Ānanda became a lay-disciple and henceforth observed the vows earnestly.[1]

Now it is worthwhile to note that the procedure adopted by the Buddhists was gradually revised whereas that of the Jainas was fixed once for all. At the same time, it may also be noted that the ceremony of conversion to the Jaina fold, either as a monk or as a layman, was more festive than that of the Buddhists.

People of various social status, without any distinction, rushed to the Mahāvīra and the Buddha to give their best support and sympathy to them and their Orders as soon as they were convinced that there was such a need. Thus Lord Mahāvīra attracted a good number of persons from all classes of society. Worthy of mention among them who lent their supporting hands, in one way or the other, to the cause of Jainism were king Śreṇika and his son Kūṇika (known as Ajātaśatru in the Pāli canon) of Magadha, queen Mṛgāvatī of Kausāmbī and Celanā of Magadha, prince Megha and Abhaya of Magadha, princess Jayantī of Kauśāmbī, the well known merchant Ānanda and his wife Śivānandā of Vāṇijyagrāma, the renowned dealer in earthen vessels Saddālaputra and a host of others. So also Jainism is highly obliged to the most valued services of the eleven *gaṇadharas* in general and that of Sudharmā in particular who placed Jainism on sound footing by his able guidance and talented exposition of the tenets of Jainism after the demise of the Lord and his other ten *gaṇadharas*.

---

[1] *Uvāsagadasāo*, pp. 5-6.

Lord Buddha too succeeded in converting a good number of kings and queens, princes and princesses, nobles and ministers, treasurers and merchants on the one hand, and robbers and thieves, harlots and ruffians on the other. Thus one of the most influential kings of the time like Bimbisāra of Magadha, very probably the richest treasurer of the time like Anāthapiṇḍika of Śrāvastī, the most handsome courtesan Ambapālī of Vaiśālī, the most devoted *upāsikā* Viśākhā and the best qualified doctor of the time like Jīvaka were some of the best supporters who had no equal in their respective services to Buddhism. Among others whose contributions to Buddhism were in no way less important than their were Prasenajita and Udena, Vāsabhakṣatriya and Roja Malla, Sāmāvatī and Supriyā, Sāriputra and Maudaglyāyana, Mahāprajāpati Gautamī and Sīhā, Abhayarājakumāra and Yasa, Nandaka and Anuruddha, Upāli and Ananda, and several others.

(iv) Conversion of heretics

Lord Buddha had hardly any intention to set forth any special rule for the conversion of ascetics formerly belonging to non-Buddhistic sects. The case of the Jaṭilas and several others may be cited as illustrations. However the nuisance created by the converted heretics led to the imposition of some restrictions, a preliminary training or probation (*parivāsa*) for a period of four months upon those coming to embrace religious life from other religious sects.

The preliminary training or *parivāsa* was not a formality as entry into the Order was not open to all on whom the *parivāsa* had once been laid. As such only he who during the *parivāsa* period, did not forbear

(i) to go to the village too early or to come back to the *vihāra* too late;

(ii) to associate with harlots, widows, adult girls, eunuchs or with nuns;

(iii) not to train himself properly in various things to be done by his fellow monks;

(iv) not to show keen interest in the doctrine, etc.;

(v) to become angry and dissatisfied, if his former teacher or belief is reviled, or to become happy and satisfied, if the Buddha, the Dhamma or the Saṅgha is reviled;

was eligible for admission into the Order.

No one, as a rule, was to be exempted from this preliminary training. This restraint was however, relaxed in case of the Jaṭilas and the Sākyas on the ground that the former were *Kammavādins*, and the latter were Buddha's relatives.[1]

The Jainas do not prescribe any restriction of the kind, for example, Suka, the head of a Parivrājaka Saṅgha is received by Sthāpatyāputra along with his following without any condition.[2] The normal course of training (*sehabhūmi*) for a novice coming either from any heretical fold or from secular life is six months, four months or a week in the minimum.[3]

(c) Duties and Obligations

(i) Precepts for the converts

The converts of both the Orders, in one capacity or the other, were to conform to the strict discipline of their respective Order. As the converts had to pass through different stages of the Church hierarchy like *pabbajita* or *seha*, *upasampanna*, *thera*, *mahāthera*, etc.,[4] a separate code of conduct was prescribed for each of them. Here a brief discussion of the same will not be irrelevant.

The fundamental precepts that a Buddhist monk must keep were the ten precepts (*dasasikkhāpada*), namely, abstinence from taking life (*pāṇātipāta*), stealing (*adinnādāna*), impure living (*abrahmacariya*), lieing (*musāvāda*), drinking intoxicating drinks (*surāmerayamajjapamāda*), taking meals at the wrong time (*vikālabhojana*), all types of spectacles (*naccagītavāditavisūkadassana*), using luxurious beds (*uccāsayanamahāsayana*) and receiving precious metals (*jātaruparajatapaṭiggahana*).[1] Accordingly novices who either destroyed life; committed theft; were unholy; spoke lie; took hard drinks; spoke against the Buddha, the Dhamma or the Saṅgha; held false belief; or enjoyed sexual intercourse with nuns were liable to expulsion from the Order.[2]

---

[1] *MV*, 1. 30. 86.87, pp. 73-76.

[2] *Nāyā*, p. 78.

[3] *Ṭhāṇ*, 159, p. 129b.

[4] *Śekha*, *śrāmaṇera*, *śrāmaṇerī*, *śaikṣamānā*, *antevāsikā*, *saddhivihārika*, *thera*, *mahāthera*, etc. are the different stages of Indian mendicants.

The primary precepts to be observed by the Jaina Order of monks and nuns were the five great vows (*pañcamahavvaya*), *viz.*, absolute abstinence from inflicting injury to sentient beings (*pāṇāivāya*), perfect abstinence from telling a lie (*musāvāya*), total avoidance of stealing (*adinnādāna*), perfect continence (*mehuṇa*) and abandonment of all possessions (*pariggaha*).[3]

These two sets of precepts, one for the Buddhists (*sikkhāpada*) and the other for the Jainas (*mahavvaya*) when compared give the impression that they do not differ much from one another. The first four *sikkhāpadas* agree entirely with that of the first four *mahavvayas*, and the tenth with that of the fifth, which 'is much more comprehensive than the corresponding one of the Buddhist'[4]. The rest being one or other form of impure life come under the range of the third *sikkhāpada*.[5] Thus the only difference between the *sikkhāpadas* and the *mahavvayas* is of number and not of principle which justifies the name *sikkhāpada* given to the *mahavvayas* by the *Uttarādhyayana*[6] and seems to have misguided a few scholar to regard 'the Jainas merely as one of the oldest sects of Buddhism'[7].

It will follow that these precepts, though not with the same strictness as in case of the monks and the nuns are also to be followed by lay-devotees belonging not only to the faith concerned but by the human beings in general. These precepts being the very ideal of the Indian way of life since times immemorial, it is difficult to ascertain as to who introduced them first.

---

[1] *MV*, 1. 47. 106, p. 87.

[2] Ibid, 1. 53. 51, p. 89.

[3] *Āyār* (*SBE*, Vol. XXII), 2. 15 (pp. 202-210); *Samv*, 5, p. 10a; *Ṭhān*, 389, p. 290a; *Uttar*, 30. 2; *Anig*, p. 36; Later on abstinence from night-meal was also added to the list of *mahavvayas*. *Dasv*, 4. 1-5 (pp. 5-6); *Aup*, 34.

[4] *SBE*. Vol. XXII, Introduction, p. 23.

[5] The seventh and eighth *sikkhāpadas* are considered as one. See *Aṅguttaranikāya*, Vol. III, 8. 5. 1.

[6] *Uttar*, 23. 12; 23. 23.

[7] *SBE*. Vol. XXII, Introduction, p. 18. One of the four points of resemblance between Buddhism and Jainism cited by Prof. Lassen is *ahiṁsā*, the first *sikkhāpada* or the first *mahavvaya*—Ibid, p. 21.

As the Jaina Order was more particular about bodily purification, it admonished the mendicants to observe the five *samitis*, i. e., restraints as regards movement; speech; begging, receiving and returning of requisites; and the disposition of bodily excreta. Besides, they were also expected to practise three *guptis*, i. e., control over the mind, speech and body; and ten *yatidharmas*, namely, forgiveness, non-attachment, non-deceit, modesty, carefulness, truthfulness, self-restraint, penance, non-possession and celibacy most likely with a view to have control over the mind as well.[1]

Perfection in the tenets of monkhood, strict observance of the customs and practices of Church life, implicit faith in the teacher and perfect obedience to the superiors were some of the criteria which made a novice fit for ordination. It was therefore necessary for the neophytes to keep these precepts strictly at least during their probationary period. Along with these, they were obliged to live corporate life as there was every likelihood for them of committing a grave offence when alone.[2] It was in order to enable a monk either to practise concentration and acquire a high degree of control by avoiding disputes, quarrels, passions, etc.,[3] or to evade troubles and dangers[4] that a monk was allowed to lead a solitary life.

The practice of monk life being dependent entirely on the society for the necessities of life it was likely for the monks to go astray when coming in contact with the society for their provisions and other needs. Consequently their requirements were curtailed so much so that they might not have to mix with the householders frequently and develop intimacy with them. The imposition of the four *nissayas*, i. e. the rules, that a monk must be satisfied with the food given in alms, that a monk must be contented with the robes gathered from dust-heaps, that a monk must be pleased with the foot of a tree as his abode and that a monk's requirements for medicine must be fulfilled by stinking-urine (*pūtimutta*)[5]—to which the Sakkaputtiya monks should take recourse to for their maintenance, though the strictness of the rules was relaxed forthwith. So far as the requisites of the Jaina monks were concerned they were simply advised to be as light as the wind.[6]

---

1. Vide *Supra*, pp 33-36.
2. *MV*, 1. 70. 129, p. 100; *Vav*, 4. 5-8.
3. *Uttar*, 29. 39.
4. *OghN*, 7, p. 13b; Comm. pp. 14a.
5. *MV*, 1. 22. 73, p. 55; 6. 69. 128, p. 100.
6. *Dasv*, 3. 10; *Suyg* (*SBE*, Vol. XLV). p. 235.

Self-mortification is the sublime object of the Jaina faith. It is therefore proper that rigorous ascetic practices are made obligatory for all monks and nuns. One of such practices is the twenty-two *parisahas* which may be termed as troubles. The practice of all these *parisahas* means giving all sorts of tortures to the body by neglecting it completely. The next is the twelve types of *tapa*—six external and six internal, the only motive of the former seems to torture the body to the maximum by abstaining from food and drink, while the latter envisage a perfect moral training. The *paḍimās*, twelve in number, are more or less a lengthy process of self-mortification based on *aṇasaṇa* (fasting), *jhāṇa* (meditation) and *kausagga* (bodily postures).[1] Thus the Jaina ascetics emaciate their bodies and mar their appearance very likely in order to detach themselves from worldly life and also to cause indifference in others towards themselves so that they may not be misled from the right path.

A convert of the Buddhist Order was also expected to observe austerity in respect of food, dress and dwelling. These austre practices known as the *dhutaṅgas* were thirteen in number, namely, (i) use of food procured from begging-tours only, (ii) begging alms from door to door without any omission, (iii) taking food only once a day, (iv) eating food from one bowl only (v) taking no meal again after finishing once, (vi) use of robes gathered from dust-heaps, (vii) using not more than three robes, (viii) dwelling in forests only, (ix) living under the foot of a tree, (x) living in open sky, (xi) living in cemetery, (xii) use of whatever bed or seat is available, and (xiii) spending the night sitting and not lying. That these practices were most likely optional has already been observed.[2]

Lastly the Buddhist Order distinguished itself by professing a definite number of transgressions and expiations for monks and nuns, 227 for the former and 311 for the latter, known as the rules of *Pātimokkha* which were regularly recited at the fortnightly meeting, the *Uposatha*.[3]

Both the Orders in question prescribed, more or less, separate rules of moral discipline for lay-adherents. But it has already been noted that the lay-devotees were given a peculiar position by the Buddhist Order. Neither they were treated as regular members of the Order nor were recognised to form a separate Order of their own.

---

[1] Vide *Supra*, pp. 36-39.

[2] Vide *Supra*, p 43.

[3] Vide *Infra*, 'Uposatha' and Chap. IV, Sec. III.

The scanty references occurring in the Pāli canon show that the monks were interested in the laities not because they earnestly wished to lead them in their struggle for the attainment of the *summum bonum*, but simply because they were the source of their maintenance and support. Therefore, a householder was frequently advised to give his unqualified help to the Saṅgha and to have implict faith in the Buddha, the Dhamma and the Saṅgha, and was seldom asked to work out his own salvation.

What is desired to bring to notice is that the precepts meant for the householders are very very limited Out of the innumerable rules of the Vinaya, perhaps the first eight of the ten *sikkhāpadas* are the only precepts which a householder should follow in line with the monks.[1] Likewise, in the whole corpus of the four Nikāyas, the *Sigālovadasutta* is the solitary instance which is completely devoted to the instruction and exhortation of a householder, and hence, is aptly called *Gihivinaya* or Vinaya of the householder. According to the *Sutta*, a householder should avoid the fourteen evils, namely, the four vices (*kammakilesa*) like destruction of life, stealing, licentiousness and false speech; evil actions (*pāpakamma*) done from the four motives of partiality (*chanda*), enmity (*dosa*), stupidity (*moha*) and fear (*bhaya*) and six ways of dissipation of wealth (*apāyamukhāni*), *viz.* addiction to intoxicating drinks, frequenting the streets at unseemly hours, haunting fairs, gambling, association with evil companions and illness. Further he is admonished to render his best possible services to his parents, wife, children, friends and companions, and *Śramaṇa-brāhmaṇas*. Thus what a layman or a lay-woman is taught is to become a pious lay-devotee.[2]

But opposed to this, the Jaina lay community is recognised as separate Orders known as the *Śrāvakasaṅgha* and *Śrāvikāsaṅgha*, quite distinct from the Orders of the monks and nuns respectively.[3] Therefore the Jaina lay community, besides their positive duties to provide to the mendicants the necessities of life, had to follow a separate course of moral discipline which is set forth in great details in the Jaina canon.

The primary precepts to be followed by a Jaina layman or laywoman, we have already seen in case of Ānanda, are the twelvefold duties of a *śrāvaka* or a *śrāvikā*, viz. the five *aṇuvvayas*, three *guṇavvayas* and four *sikkhāvvayas*. The *aṇuvvayas* or the minor vows, as the very tittle suggests, differ from the *mahavvayas* in degree and not in contents. The three *guṇavvayas* consist of abstinence from indulgence in unprofitable occupation (*anatthadaṇḍaveramaṇa*), limitation with reference to movements in a particular direction (*disivvaya*) and limitation as to articles of use (*uvabhogaparibhogaparimāṇa*). The four *sikkhāvvayas* are equanimity and abandonment of sinful activities (*sāmāiya*), limitation of space in connection with movement (*desāvagāsiya*), observing fasts on certain days of each fortnight (*posahovavāsa*) and equal distribution of charities to guests (*atihisaṁvibhāga*).[1]

---

[1] Rhys Davids, *Buddhism*, p 139.

[2] *DN*, Vol. III, pp. 139-149.

[3] *Ṭhāṇ*, 363, p. 281b; *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), pp. 267-268.

Besides these twelvefold vows, those who claim to be more pious and faithful to the Religion observed the eleven *paḍimās*, that is, they cultivated right faith (*daṁsaṇapaḍimā*), practised the five *aṇuvratas* (*vayapaḍimā*), equanimity (*sāmāiyapaḍimā*), fasts (*posahapaḍimā*), led pious life abstaining from bath, night-meal and sexual indulgence during day for a period of five months (*paḍimāpaḍimā*), abstained from all types of sexual pleasures for six months (*abaṁbhavajjaṇapaḍimā*), the use of raw articles of food for seven months (*sacittāhāravajjaṇapaḍimā*), injurious activities for eight months (*sayamāraṁbhavajjaṇapaḍimā*), asking even others to do injurious works for them for nine months (*udiṭṭhabhattavajjaṇapaḍimā*), and finally imitated the life of a monk (*samaṇabhūyapaḍimā*).[2]

Thus the object of the whole teaching for the Jaina laity in general and that of the *paḍimās* in particular seem to lead them gradually on the path of monkhood as is clear from the name of the last *paḍimā*, the *samaṇabhūyapaḍimā*.

(ii) *Teachers and disciples*

In accordance with the Brahmaṇical tradition, a monk as well as a nun, whether Buddhist or Jaina, is placed under the direct supervision of superiors, the former under that of the *ācārya* and the *upādhyāya*, and the latter under that of the *pravartinī*.[3] This relation between the teacher and the disciple is called *nissaya*[4] by the Buddhists, and *uvasaṁpayā*[5] or *purao kaṭṭu* (*kātuṁ*) *viharai*[6] or *disaṁ* (*aṇudisaṁ*) *viharai*[7] by the Jainas. Once it has been stated that *antevāsika, saddhivihārika, sekkha* or *seha, sāmaṇera, sāmaṇerī, sikkhamānā,* etc. are some of the epithets given to a newly converted person. The Buddhists call a novice placed under the care of an *ācariya* (teacher) as *antevāsika,* and under that of the *upajjhāya* (preceptor) as *saddhivihārika.* Though these appelations obtain with the Jainas, even then they are not so particular about such a distinction.

---

[1] *Uvāsagadasāo*, pp. 3-21; 206-208; *Aup*, 34-35.

[2] Ibid, pp. 16; 224–229; *Dasā*, 6th *dasā*.

[3] *Vav*, 3 11f; *MV*, 1. 18. 64 65, pp. 42f; 1. 23. 74-77, pp. 56f; *CV*, 10. 11. 24, pp. 393-94.

[4] *MV*, 1. 26. 82, p. 67.

[5] *Ṭhāṇ*, 174, p. 139a; Comm. p. 139b; *Uttar*, 26. 7.

[6] *Vav*, 4. 11; *Bṛhk*, 3. 14.

[7] Ibid, 1. 22-24; *Nis*, 10. 11f.

A disciple is expected to behave according to the wishes and orders of the teacher, and to give him every service, while the teacher to take him under his protection and care, and to give him every help and guidance in his monastic career. In view of these facts it is most befitting that a teacher and a disciple are advised to live like father and son.[1]

The Buddhist Order did not deem it proper either to give *nissaya* to or to receive it from an unconscientious person. Therefore it asked the monks to study the conduct of a monk before giving him *nissaya* or receiving it from him.[2] The Jaina Order, though not directly, also issued instructions to the same effect. Thus a monk who was *aviniya* (immodest), *vigaḍipaḍibaddha* (attached to dainty food), *avvavasiya* (not servile), *duṭṭha* (wicked), *muḷha* (dullard), and *vuggāhiya* (quarrelsome) should not be accepted as a student.[3] The other ten reasons which made a monk unfit for becoming a good student were *dappa* (pride), *pamāda* (carelessness), *ṇābhoga* (inattention), *āura* (bodily pangs), *āvati* (calamities), *saṁkila* (indecision), *sahassakāra* (unexpected circumstances), *bhaya* (fear), *ppayosa* (hatred) and *vimaṁsā* (test of the teacher by the student). Only a monk of good caste and good family was expected to be conscientious and self-controlled, and to confess his omission and commission before the superior.[4]

In the Jaina Church, a monk, how much senior and experienced he might have been, owed life-long dependance on all senior to him in general and on his teacher in particular. But the Buddhist Order subjugated only those who were deficient in one or the other rule of monastic discipline.[5] Not even that, a person on a journey, a sick, a person waiting upon a sick and a forest-dweller were excluded from such dependance.[6] The earliest law, no doubt, required a dependance

---

1. *MV*, 1. 18. 65, p 43; 1. 23. 77, p. 58; *Uttar*, 1. 39.
2. Ibid, 1. 63. 120, p. 95.
3. *Ṭhān*, 203, p. 165b.
4. Ibid, 733, p. 484a.
5. *MV*, 1. 45. 103, pp. 83-86.
6. Ibid, 1. 64. 121, p. 96.

of not less than ten years[1] which was cut short when the monk refused to accompany the Blessed One with the following reply to Ānanda :

> "Friend Ānanda, the Blessed One has prescribed that Bhikkhus are to live the first ten years in dependance (on their *ācariyas* and *upajjhāyas*), and that he who has completed his tenth year, may give a *nissaya* himself. Now if we go there, we shall be obliged to take a *nissaya* there; then we shall stay there for a short time, then we must go back again and take a new *nissaya*. If our *ācariyas* and *upajjhāyas* go, we will go also; if our *ācariyas* and *upajjhāyas* do not go, we will not go either. Otherwise our lightmindedness, friend Ānanda, will become manifest".[2]

The Pāli Vinaya contains elaborate rules concerning the duties and obligations of a disciple towards his teacher and *vice versa*. The principal duties which are binding on a disciple are the menial works of the whole *vihāra* in general and that of the teacher in particular.[3] The Jaina monks are also prescribed the same type of duties and obligations, though these are not arranged systematically at one place.[4] Perhaps the reason behind the fact that all the menial works of the teacher or rather that of the whole monastery are to be performed by the juniors is that we know of no servant employed by the Saṅgha. Besides, a disciple is also to help his teacher in doctrinal and ecclesiastical matters, if there is such an occasion.[5] The details in this respect may be worked out as below.

A disciple having got up earlier than the teacher should provide him teeth-cleanser, rinsing water, a seat and rice-gruel. Then he should give him water, wash the bowl and sweep the place when he has finished the rice-gruel At the time of proceeding for alms, he should give him robes, girdle and alms-bowl, and take from him the robes taken off. If the teacher desires that his disciple should follow him, the disciple should accompany him duly clad and with his alms-bowl. When accompanying, the disciple should be at a considerable distance from the teacher, and should take the contents of his alms-bowl. So also he should return to the *vihāra* from the begging-tour before the teacher so that he may furnish him with a seat, water and a towel, may take his alms-bowl and robes taken off and may provide him his house-dress (*paṭinivāsa*), water and food in due time. He

---

1. *MV*, 1. 16. 82, p. 67.
2. Ibid, 1. 44. 102, pp. 82-83.
3. Ibid, 1. 18 64-66, pp. 42-47; 1. 23. 74-78, pp. 56-62.
4. Cf. *Bṛhk*, 3. 21.
5. *MV*, 1 18. 66, pp. 46-47; 1. 23. 78, pp. 61; *Ṭhāṇ*, 135, p. 118a.

should keep the robes taken off and the alms-bowl having dried them properly in the sun.

A disciple must also make every arrangement for his teacher's bath, such as, getting cold or hot water as desired by the teacher, providing kneaded powder, moistened clay and chair, take the chair back from the bath-room, wipe the water off from his body and give him his robes, etc.

It was the duty of a disciple to clean the *vihāra* inhabited by the teacher. The sanitation of a *vihāra* which normally was furnished with *pariveṇas* (cells), a *koṭṭhaka* (store-room), an *upaṭṭhānasālā* (service-hall), an *aggisālā* (fire-room) and a *vaccakuṭi* (privy) comprised of works like removing the cobwebs, wiping off the casements and the corners of the room after taking away the alms-bowl, the robes, the mat and other furniture; scouring the walls with a wet mop; sprinkling the floor with water and casting aside the sweepings. The furniture, etc. which had been disturbed at the time of cleaning should be placed at their respective places having dried them in the sun.

A disciple should always be heedful in shutting the windows, if dusty wind is blowing through them. Normally he should open them by day and shut at night in winter and *vice versa* in summer. So also he should get his teacher's robes washed, made and dried.

Besides the menial works of the *vihāra* in general and that of the teacher in particular, a disciple is expected to assist his teacher in ecclesiastical matters as well. Accordingly, he is allowed to interrupt the teacher in his speech, if he is feared to commit an offence by words. It is also a credit on the part of a disciple, if he so occasions that the teacher delivers a discourse or answers questions put to him. It is not less creditable, if he removes or gets removed by another person or by religious conversation, the discontent (*anabhirati*), the indecision (*kukkucca*) and false belief (*diṭṭhi*), if the teacher has come in their grip. Moreover, it is also the duty of a disciple to see his teacher sentenced to *Parivāsa* (probation), *Mūlāyapaṭikassanā* (recommencement of penal discipline), *Mānatta* (fixed probation) or *Abbhāna* (rehabilitation); releaved from the ecclesiastical proceedings which are to be carried out against him; or the punishment alleviated. If however the proceeding has been carried out, he should cause the teacher to behave properly in order to get rid of it.

Because of the very difference in the fundamental principle, a Jaina monk is not asked to serve his teacher in a way exactly analogous to that of the Buddhist. Very likely the Jaina Order does not prescribe any service to be given to the teacher at the time of his setting out for begging alms or after coming back from begging-tour. At best he is asked to show the contents of his begging-bowl after his return from begging-tour. It never implies that the Jaina monks are not prescribed any duty towards his teacher. The discipline to be observed towards the teacher which is laid down in the *Vinayasutta* of the *Uttarādhyayana* is indeed very stringent. We may refer to the first chapter where it has been discussed under the heading 'daily duties of a Jaina monk'.

It is to be noted that the duties of a teacher towards his disciple are almost the same as those of a disciple towards his teacher just referred to. A teacher, besides his spiritual help by exhortation and instruction, is to supply his disciple robes, alms-bowl and other *parikkhāra* (requisites), and even to serve him with chunam, clay, etc, if he is in such a need. These mutual duties and obligations seem to have placed a teacher and a disciple on the same footing in the Buddhist hierarchy.[1]

What installed a teacher to a position higher than the disciple were the following discipline to be observed by the disciple towards his teacher. A disciple without the permission of his teacher is forbidden to :

(i) give his alms-bowl, robes or any *parikkhāra* to any one else or to receive it from any one ;
(ii) shave any one else or to get himself shaved by any one ;
(iii) wait upon any one else or to let any one wait upon himself ;
(iv) go with any one else as an attendant-monk or to take any one as an attendant-monk ;
(v) carry any one else's alms to the *vihāra*, or to have his alms carried by any one else ; and
(vi) go to a village or a cemetary or abroad on journey.[2]

Like the Buddhist, a Jaina teacher was also obliged to supply the material requisites of his disciples,[3] but he was perhaps not asked to give menial services to his disciples in normal circumstances. Like the Buddhists, the Jaina monks were not allowed to :

(i) accept food for and to give it to a sick monk,[4]
(ii) receive a begging-bowl,[5]

---

[1] *Vinaya Texts* (*SBE*, Vol. XIII) p. 49, fn. 5.

[2] *MV*, 1. 18. 66, p. 47; 1. 23. 78, p. 61-62; *CV*, 8. 11. 21, p. 332; 8. 13 25, p. 340.

[3] *Ṭhān*, 544, p. 385b.

[4] *Kapp* (*SBE* Vol. XXII), p. 297.

[5] *Bṛhk*, 1. 30-42.

(iii) do any transaction of the begging-bowl or any other requisite,[1]

(iv) undertake a journey,[2]

(v) go elsewhere due to paucity of space[3] without the previous permission of the teacher or the authority concerned.

Of course, the Jainas surpassed the Buddhists in giving an exalted position to the teacher. It is said in the Jaina scriptures that a disciple without a teacher is likely to go astray as a needle without a thread may be lost easily.[4]

(d) The Causes of Renunciation

Most probably the Buddhist sources do not make any direct reference to the causes of renunciation. However, an analysis of the frequent references to persons bidding farewell to household life reveals that people took to mendicant-life because of diverse reasons and varied motives. Normally people adopted monkhood because of the natural insight into the Truth (*abhisamaya*). Another reason which inspired Kassapa, Senaka, Nadīkassapa, Uruvela Kassapa, Jenta, Mahāpanthaka, Cūlapanthaka, Raṭṭhapāla, Sela, Aṅgulimāla, etc. among men and Ubbiri, Sakulā, Kisāgotamī, etc. among women to renounce household life was the thrilling mental agitation (*saṁvega*) caused by either of the imposing personality and the preaching of the Buddha or his disciples.

Unfortunate incidents like the death of a child, widowhood or husband's renunciation, etc. were not less responsible for making a person to adopt houselessness. Thus Vāseṭṭhī and Kisāgotamī renounced the world when their sons died. So did Candā and Cāpā because of their husbands' expiry and renunciation respectively. One of the most disgusting factors which constrained people, particularly the women to renounce the world was the transitoriness of bodily beauty and charm. Abhayamātā, Uppalavaṇṇā, Ambapāli, etc. took to nunhood due to this very fact. Besides, very often household drudgery and poverty, illness and deformity, disrespect and humiliation, and the like also acted as reasons for renouncing the pleasures of family life. Those accepting monk-life because of one or the other of these

---

1. *Nis*, 14. 1-4, 14. 5-7; 16. 25-29.
2. *OghN*, 9, p. 22b; *HJM*, p. 243.
3. *Vav*, 1. 21.
4. *HJM*, p. 156.

reasons were Sumaṅgala, Ātuma, Māṇava, Muttā, Sumaṅgalamātā, Samitigutta, Khujjasobhita, Sopāka, Sunīta, etc.[1]

Sometimes people also betook to monk-life for the sake of livelihood (*udarassa kāraṇā*).[2]

The various circumstances and motives of renunciation referred to in the Jaina texts do not differ much from those of the Buddhist. According to the *Sthānāṅgasūtra*, people usually took to monkhood due to inner urge for renunciation (*chanda*), anger (*rosa*), poverty (*parijuṇṇā*), enlightenment in a dream (*suviṇā*), fulfilment of a particular vow (*paḍissutā*), sudden remembrance of previous births (*sāraṇitā*), illness (*rogiṇītā*), humiliation (*aṇāḍhitā*), inspiration by the gods (*devasannattī*), and renunciation of one's son (*vacchāṇubandhitā*).[3]

These reasons enumerated by the *Sthānāṅgasūtra* are further corroborated by actual cases of renunciation. Neminātha having come to know that his marriage would cost a number of lives, renounced the pleasures and prospects of wordly life, and Rājīmatī, his would-be-wife also followed him. So also Vāseṭṭhī became nun as her husband and sons took to monkhood. Poṭṭilā too adopted nun-life because of her husband's indifference, and Śivabhūti due to anger.[4]

Besides, a number of persons gave up family life simply for worldly gains like the acquisition of living (*ihaloga*), the collection of disciples (*puraopaḍibaddhā*), the consolation in lonely life (*vihagagaī*), getting rid of debt (*moyāvaittā*), etc., while others were either forced or induced to adopt monkhood. The various tricks played upon them in order to make them inclined for renunciation were creating trouble (*tuyāvaittā*), taking a person elsewhere (*puyāvaittā*), conditional vow for renunciation (*saṁgārapavvajjā*) and religious instructions.[5]

(e) Bars to Admission

As a rule, everybody was allowed to join the Order. But in due course, certain persons were debarred from entry into the Saṅgha because they were regarded not only unworthy of monastic life, but also inconvenient to the progress and welfare of the Saṅgha in one way or the other. In order to maintain the high moral standard of

---

1. For these references see *KN*, Vol II, *Theragāthā and Therīgāthā*.
2. *MV*, 1. 22. 73, p. 55.
3. *Op. cit.*, 712, p. 473b.
4. Vide *Uttar*, xxii for Neminātha and Rājīmatī; *Uttar*, xxiv for Vāseṭṭhī; *Nāyā*, xiv for Poṭṭilā; *Cūrṇi* to *Āvas*, for Śivabhūti; *Supra*, p. 12, fn. 5.
5. *Ṭhān*, 157, p. 128b; 355, pp. 276ab.

the Church, both the Churches laid down certain criteria to test the fitness or otherwise of those wishing to join the Order. In this way they tried to keep the Church clear of worthless fellows. Before making any general observation, it would be better to have a comparative glimpse of the same.

Excluding the thirteen types of disqualifications[1] which made a man or a woman unfit for Church life, the disqualifications to be asked of a woman at the time of her initiation were eleven types of female disease.[2] Besides these, there were several other disqualifications which debarred those desiring entry into the Buddhist Order. Similarly in addition to the eighteen types of male or female (namely, a fool, an old, a eunuch, an idiot, an impotent, an ailing person, a thief, king's enemy, a mad, a blind, a slave, a wicked person, a blockhead, a person in debt, a deformed person, a prisoner, a timid and a trainee with unhinged mind)[3] who were disqualified for Jaina monastic life, a pregnant woman (*guvviṇī*), a woman having a small child (*bālavacchā*), ten types of eunuchs etc. had also to share the same fate.[4]

Both Buddhism and Jainism, though with different motives, concurred that ailing persons were unworthy of monastic life. The former considered them a disturbance to peaceful Church life, whereas the latter found them unable to conform to the rules of Church discipline Hence, persons inflicted with any one of the five incurable diseases, *viz.* leprosy (*kuṭṭha*), boils (*gaṇḍa*), eczema (*kilāsa*), consumption (*sosa*) and fits (*apumāra*)[5] or with goitre (*galagaṇḍī*), or with elephantiasis (*sīpadī*), or with a chronic disease (*pāparogī*)[6] were precluded from the claim of entering into the Buddhist Order.

The Jaina Church had its counterpart in the regulations that a person suffering either from any one of the sixteen types of chronic diseases (*roga*), such as *vevaggi* (tremour or aque), *paṅgu* (lameness), *vaḍabha* (hump-back), *nimmaṇimalasa*, *sakkarapameha* (diabetes), *bahira* (deafness), *andha* (blindness), *kuṇṭa* (mutilation), *gaṇḍī* (goitre), *koṭikkhata* (paralysed?) and *sūī* (suffering from colic ?)[7], or from any one

---

1. *MV*, 1. 68. 125, p. 97.
2. *CV*, 10. 10. 22, p. 391.
3. Comm. to *Ṭhāṇ*, p. 165a.
4. *NisB*, 3737-3744.
5. *MV*, 1. 31, 88, p. 76; 1. 68. 125, p. 97.
6. Ibid, 1. 62. 119, pp. 94-95.
7. *NisB*, 3645-3646.

of the eight types of acute diseases (*vāhi*), namely, fever (*jara*), asthma (*sāsa*), cough (*kāsa*), burning (*dāha*), diarrhoea (*atisāra*), fistula (*bhagandara*) etc.[1] was not allowed to join the Jaina Church.

Physical disability either in the form of deformity or loss of limbs was also an obstacle to monkhood. The Buddhist Church deemed a person whose hands or feet were cut off (*hatthacinnaṁ vā pādachinnaṁ vā*) or whose hands were like snake's hood (*phaṇahatthaka*), a hump-back (*khujja*), a dwarf (*vāmaṇa*), a one-eyed person (*kāṇa*), a person with crooked limb (*kuṇī*), a lame (*khañja*), a person paralysed on one side (*pakkhahata*), a cripple (*chinnairiyāpatha*), a blind (*andha*), a dumb (*mūga*), a deaf (*badhira*), a blind and dumb (*andhamūga*), a blind and deaf (*andhabadhira*), a dumb and deaf (*mūgabadhira*), and a blind, dumb and deaf (*andhamūgabadhira*), etc. disqualified for monk-life.[2] The Jaina Church was fully in consonance with the Buddhist as it also refused admission to person despised because of physical deformity, as for example, a person whose hands, feet, ears, nose or lips were cut off, a dwarf (*vāmaṇaga*), hump-back (*vaḍabha*), hunch-back (*khujja*), a lame (*paṅgula*), a mutilated person (*kuṇṭa*), a one-eyed man and a blind (*adaṁsaṇe*).[3] Besides, it also denied initiation to a dullard (*jaḍḍa*)[4], an insane person (*ummatta*)[5], a wicked person (*duṭṭha*)[6] and a stupid (*mūḍha*)[7].

Neither the Buddhists nor the Jainas ever gave a better position to robbers and thieves. The Buddhist sources refer to a renowned robber *dhajabaddhacora*), a robber escaped from jail (*kārakabhedaka*), a registered thief (*likhitaka*), a whipped thief (*kasāhata*) and a branded thief (*lakkaṇāhata*)[8] and the Jaina to a village-thief *gāmateṇa*), an urban-thief (*desateṇa*), a lifter (*antarateṇa*), a looter (*addhāṇateṇa*), a plunderer (*takkara*) and a burglar (*khāṇateṇa*)[9]; who were debarred from entering into the Order.

The Buddhists as well as the Jainas never received a debtor (*iṇāyaka* or *aṇatta*) or a slave (*dāsa*) as a monk.[10] Along with it the

---

[1] *NisB*, 3647.
[2] *MV*, 1. 62. 119, pp. 94-95.
[3] *NisB*, 3709-3711.
[4] Ibid, 3625-3636.
[5] Ibid, 3670-3671.
[6] Ibid, 3681-3693.
[7] Ibid, 3694-3702.
[8] *MV*, 1. 33-37. 91-95, pp. 78-79.
[9] *NisB*, 3650-3662.
[10] *MV*, 1.38.96, p. 79.

Buddhists refused entry to a person in royal service, specially to soldiers and warriors.[1] The Jainas even surpassed the Buddhists as they disallowed all those who were king's enemy (*rāyāvagārī*)[2], an attendant (*obaddha*) and servant (*bhayae*)[3]. This favour to the kings or authorities in power was, very likely, due to the fact that the Order whether Buddhist, Jaina or any other never deemed it proper to be in enmity with them as their goodwill and piety were essential for the survival and progress of the Church.

Likewise sexual disability or deformity was also a hindrance to initiation or ordination. Both the Orders unanimously advocated that a eunuch of any type should not be ordained or should be expelled, if ordained under the pressure of the king or due to any other reason. The Buddhist sources, however, refer to a person giving an offence by any deformity to those who happened to see him (*purisadūsaka*)[4],a eunuch (*paṇḍaka*)[5] and a hermaphrodite (*ubhatobyañjanaka*)[6]; and the Jaina to sixteen types of sexually defective persons (*napuṁsaka*), such as, eunuch (*paṇḍaka*), sexually diseased (*vātie*), timid (*kiva*), castrated (*baddhie*), etc[7]. All these were declared disqualified for Church life.

Old age was no less a disqualification for monkhood.[8] So also was childhood. Originally the Buddhist Order did not confer *pabbajjā* on a boy under fifteen years of age. This strictness was however slackened by allowing a boy less than fifteen years of age but able to scare crow (*kākuṭṭepaka*) to enter the Order.[9] In all cases *upasampadā* (ordination or confirmation of the initiation) was to be conferred only on a person full twenty years of age from the time of conception in one's mother's womb.[10] The Jaina Order however lowered the age limit for initiation to eight years.[11] It is clear from the instances of two children one receiving initiation at the age of six years[12] and the other at the age of six months only,[13] that it was the psychological leaning of the child rather than his age that constrained the Jainas to admit even a baby to their Order. At another place, the express sanction to initiate a child all the members of whose family intended to join the Order, a child whose all relatives but the father-monk were dead, an orphan with right faith, an orphaned issue of the *sejjāyara*, the issue of a raped nun, and any child of the kind[1] without any consideration of their age reveals that the Jaina Order took utmost care of those friends and relatives, specially of their orphaned children, who were in distress and trouble. Thus the Jaina Church saved the society from chaos and corruption.

---

[1] *MV*, 1. 32. 90, pp. 77-78.
[2] *NisB*, 3663-3669.
[3] Com. to *Ṭhāṇ*, p. 165a; *NisB*, 3676-3680.
[4] *MV*, 1. 62. 119, p. 94.
[5] Ibid, 1. 52. 109, p. 89.
[6] Ibid, 1. 59. 116, p. 92.
[7] *NisB*, 3561-3624.
[8] *MV*, 1. 62. 119, pp. 94-95.
[9] Ibid, 1. 42. 100, p. 82.
[10] Ibid, 1. 67. 124, p. 97.
[11] *Vav*, 10. 16f; Comm. to *Bhag*, p. 219b; *NisB*, 3510-3516.
[12] *Bhag*, 188, p. 219b.
[13] *Cūrṇi* to *Āvas*, pp. 391ff.

Not only the Buddhists but the Jainas as well were not in favour of initiating a person weak from old age (*jarādubbala* or *vuḍḍha*).[2] Particularly the Jaina Order ordained that religion should be practised 'while old age has not begun to ail, or disease has not grown, or senses have not failed'.[3]

Nobody could get entry either in the Buddhist[4] or in the Jaina Order without the consent of one's parents or guardian. It was therefore justified that a kidnapped person (*sehanipphediya*) was denied the right of initiation to the Jaina Order.[5]

Besides, a person who has furtively joined the Saṅgha (*theyyasaṁvāsaka*), a person who has gone over to the heretics (*titthiyapakkantaka*)[6], an animal (*tiracchānagata*)[7], a matricide (*mātughātaka*)[8], a parricide (*pitughātaka*)[9], a murderer of *arahanta*[10], a violator of a nun (*bhikkhunīdūsaka*), a dissenter (*saṅghabhedaka*) and a person who has shed Buddha's blood (*lohituppādaka*)[11] are not to be ordained or to be expelled from the Saṅgha, if ordained. This sort of disqualifications is not to be found in the Jaina sources, yet it may be accepted at least that the Jaina Order would also have shown the same consideration towards such criminals in order to preserve the purity of the Saṅgha. In this connection it may also be pointed out that the crimes like murder of an *arahanta*, etc. find their counterpart in the

---

1. *Cūrṇi* to *NisB*, 3537-3539.
2. *NisB*, 3542-3560; Comm. to *Ṭhān*, p. 165a.
3. *Dasv*, 8 36.
4. *MV*, 1. 46 105, pp 86-87.
5. Comm. to *Ṭhān*, p 165a.
6. *MV*, 1. 53. 110, pp. 89-90.
7. Ibid, 1. 54. 111, pp. 90-91.
8. Ibid, 1. 55. 112, p. 91.
9. Ibid, 1. 56. 113, p. 91.
10. Ibid, 1. 57. 114, pp. 91-92.
11. Ibid, 1. 58. 115, p. 92.

murder of a Brahmin in the Brahmaṇical Church. These are amongst crimes which are deemed unatonable (*mahāpātaka*) and as such entail excommunication.[1]

As we have already seen that the *upasampadā* ceremony could not be solemnised without a qualified and duly appointed *upajjhāya*, therefore, *upasampadā* should not be conferred on a person without *upajjhāya*, with the Saṅgha as *upajjhāya*, with a number of monks as *upajjhāya* or with a eunuch, etc. as *upajjhāya*. Similar was the case with a person without alms-bowl or with borrowed alms-bowl, without robes or with borrowed robes, or with borrowed alms-bowl and robes.[2]

Thus we find that both the Buddhist and the Jaina Orders scrutinised the monks-to-be (*upasampadāpekkhā* or *seha*) with utmost care and initiated only those who were found qualified and fit. Anybody who failed to convince the assembly of one's purity and competency was in no case to be entertained. If however the assembly failed to detect the deficiency and disqualifications of the person concerned and initiated him or her to the Order, then either held it up his or her ordination or drove him or her out of the Order, if already ordained.

(f) The Authority Competent to Carry out the Function

That for the Buddhists *pabbajjā* as well as *upasampadā* is out and out a *saṅgha-kamma* or a transaction of the Order which can affect the Saṅgha in any way is apparent from the preceding account. Therefore all such transactions are to be solemnised by a complete assembly lawfully. Ten is the quorum of a complete assembly eligible to confer *pabbajjā* or *upasampadā*[3] But the number of monks required in cases of the middle and the border countries are only five including a *Vinayadhara* in the chair[4]

Nuns however may be admitted into the Saṅgha even by a messenger, though the ordinary rule, no doubt requires, as in the case of monks, a chapter of not less than ten.[5]

Not only the *anusāsaka* and the *upajjhāya* or *pavattinī* (in case of nuns), two officers who took the leading part in the conversion ceremony were expected to be highly qualified and experienced, but all the monks consisting a complete assembly must also have the requisite qualifications. It is worth noticing that their competency was considered not only by seniority but also by moral integrity, erudition in the doctrine and discipline and their proper and regular practice.

---

1. *Viṣṇudharma-sūtra*, 33-42; Vide also *Hindu Law and Custom*, pp. 251-52.
2. *MV*, 1. 60-61. 117-18, pp. 92-94.
3. Ibid, 9. 4. 9, pp. 334-335.
4. Ibid, 5, 13. 26, p. 216.
5. *CV*, 10. 14. 29, pp. 397-398.

Thus, in addition to the standing in monkhood which was in no case less than ten years, the qualities expected of a monk competent to confer initiation or ordination, or to give *nissaya* (dependance), or to train a *sāmaṇera* were perfect knowledge of moral practices, self-concentration, wisdom, emancipation and an insight into emancipation; the ability to help others in the acquisition of these abilities; faith, modesty, fearfulness of sinning, strenuousness and unforgetfulness; purity in rules of morality, conduct and belief; the ability to nurse disciple in all possible ways; and a perfect knowledge of an offence and of the two *Pātimokkhas.*[1]

The Jaina initiation or ordination was conferred by an individual monk before a seated assembly of Caturvidhasaṅgha, that is, an assembly consisting of monks, nuns, laymen and laywomen. Even then, it was perhaps neither a transaction of the Saṅgha nor a business of an individual, for we are neither told of the number of monks or nuns comprising the assembly nor of any specific duty to be performed by them.

The one and the only officer who is referred to have been authorised to confer initiation and ordination upon a candidate is *āyariya* who may be equated with the *upajjhāya* of the Buddhist hierarchy. The various types of *āyariya* referred to in the Āgamas reveal that the *āyariya*, in addition to his duty to initiate and ordain a person, has also been assigned with the duty of giving instruction to newly admitted monks.[2] In this way he trains them in the tenets of the faith. As he holds such a high and responsible position, he must in all cases be highly experienced and qualified. Therefore only a monk having eight years' experience of monk-life, and the knowledge of the *Sthānāṅga* and the *Samavāyāṅga Sutras* is deemed fit for the post.[3] Besides, he is also expected to be equipped with the fivefold conduct (*āyāra*), *viz.* knowledge (*ṇāṇa*), faith (*darisaṇa*), good behaviour *cāritta*), penance (*tava*) and fortitude (*vīriyaṁ*);[4] equanimity of mind; learning; character and intellect[5].

Thus the qualifications of a Jaina *āyariya* competent to confer initiation or ordination considerably agree with that required for a Buddhist monk in general and that of the Buddhist *upajjhāya* in particular. The difference which is marked out by this study is that the Jaina initiation and ordination differed from the Buddhist as the Jainas treated it as semi-*saṅgha-kamma.*

---

1. *MV*, 1. 28-29. 84-85, pp. 67-73.
2. *Ṭhān*, 320, pp 239b-240a; *Vav*, 10. 11-12.
3. *Vav*, 3. 7.
4. Comm. to *Ṭhān*, p. 104a.
5. Dasv, 9-1, 16.

SECTION II

NISSAYAS

A careful perusal of most of the Indian religious texts, so far extant, would show that they profess a life of fewness and poverty, obedience and modesty, and purity and chastity for those intending to attain liberation. Frequent mention is made in these texts about a number of persons who retired from the world and took refuge in the lonely and fearful part of the forests in order to lead a solitary and peaceful life. There, some of them are said to have carried on various types of ascetic practices and self-mortification (*tapa*) in respect of food, dress and dwelling.[1] Lord Mahāvīra too is recorded to have followed the foot-print of his seniors and to have observed self-mortification for as many as twelve years He discarded the use of clothes altogether and accepted food in the palms of his hands. Thus he is said to have attained the *summum bonum.*[2]

At first, the Buddha too followed the same course But in his case, as we are informed, it failed to produce the desired effect. Due to this inefficacy of self-mortification, the Buddha was constrained to hold a very low opinion of it (i e. self-mortification) which is manifest in his address delivered to the Pañcavaggiya monks—"A life given to self-mortification is painful, ignoble and inefficacious"[3]. It was nothing but natural for a rational person like him to disdain rigorous ascetic practices and prefer a life of modesty. Very probably, this would have been the only reason that notwithstanding the ceaseless requests of Devadatta to make the austre-practices binding on all, the Buddha prescribed them as the things of mere taste and liking.[4]

Thus in spite of the best efforts of the Buddha to have no connection with the world even for sustenance, as certain persons are often alleged to have done, he could not. He was forced to promote intimacy with the world at least for the bare necessities of life, *viz* food to keep body and soul together, dress and dwelling to withstand the inclemency of weather and so on and so forth. All these things together, that is, food, dress and dwelling, etc., are given a technical name,

---

1. *Dialogues of the Buddha* Vol. I, pp. 226-32; *Buddhist India*, pp. 134ff.
2. *Kapp (SBE.* Vol. XXII), pp. 250-60.
3. yo cāyaṁ attakilamathānuyogo dukkho anariyo anatthasaṁhito.—*MV*, 1. 7. 13, p. 13.
4. *CV*, 7.9.14, pp. 298-99.

the *nissaya* by the Pāli Vinaya. Now we propose to ascertain the implication and significance of the term, before we go into its interminable details.

The Sanskrit equivalent of the term '*nissaya*' as Mr. Rhys Davids points out is '*niśraya*' which corresponds in meaning to the Sanskrit term '*āśraya*'.[1] As such his interpretation of the term in question as 'that on which anything depends' seems quite reasonable and correct as the life of the Buddhist monks depends on the four resources (*nissaya*). Further it will not be out of place to point out that the term *nissaya* has been used in two different cases in the Pāli Vinaya. At one place it stands for the resources, that is, for the necessities of life of a Buddhist mendicant, while at other for the relation between the teacher and the disciple which has already been discussed.[2] So now we are concerned with the first use only. The resources are four in number, *viz.*,

i. ascetic life has morsels of food gathered from begging-tours as his life-long resource,
ii. ascetic life has robes taken from dust-heaps as his life-long resource ;
iii. ascetic life has dwelling at the foot of a tree as his life-long resource, and
iv. ascetic life has stinking-urine as medicine as his life-long resource.[3]

Later on the strictness of the rules were relaxed by granting appropriate latitudes to them which were popularly known as *atirekalābha* (extra-allowance) which will be discussed in due course.

Now it may be remarked that the rules regarding the resources seem to be based on the principle that healthy body is the abode of healthy mind. Specially, the number of resources presupposes the aforesaid theory. As nobody can expect a healthy body in absence of proper sustenance and protection from the ever-changing weather, so of the four resources, the first is food, one of the most essential things to keep body and soul together, the other three being dress, dwelling and medicine ; things which are indispensable for the safety of life in

---

1. Vide Rhys Davids, *Pali English Dictionary*.
2. Vide *Supra*, p. 94; *Childers* ; *SBE*. Vol. XII, p. 182 fn; *MV*, 1,26.82, p. 67.
3. piṇḍiyālopabhojanaṁ nissāya pabbajjā, tattha te yāvajīvaṁ ussāho karaṇīyo, paṁsukūlacīvaraṁ nissāya...ussāho karaṇiyo, rukkhamūlasenāsanaṁ nissāya...ussāho karaṇiyo,pūtimuttabhesajjaṁ nissāya...ussāho karaṇīyo. --*MV*, 1.22.73, p. 65.

one way or the other. So it will not be improper to opine that the implication of the term *nissaya* is to comprise in its list all such things which are necessary if safety of life is at all required. In other words, the implied meaning of the term is 'sustenance and safety of life but with limited means', for if not so, there would have been no need of telling the four resources to the person embracing Buddhism as a monk. Thus it may be remarked that any rule regarding the resources is not rigid. Even the number of resources, if needed, may also be diminished or increased, as the case may be, by excluding or including in its list even things which are the outcome of modern sciences.

But one thing may, however, be pointed out in this connection. The Buddha as he aspired 'to convert the unconverted and to augment the number of those converted',[1] so he considered it necessary not to displease or to offend the people in any way, lest his ambition might have been nipped in the bud. And it was but natural for a farsighted person like him as the people were conscious enough to complain and comment for any omission and commission of the monks or the nuns. Such instances were not very few and far between. The people protested when the monk did not hold the *uposatha* cermony,[2] or when they did not remain at one place during the rainy season,[3] or if they observed the rain-retreat in a hollow tree,[4] or if they clad in improper robes,[5] etc. Naturally the ecclesiastical rules were repaired from time to time by promulgating new rules or by abolishing the old ones or by making amendment to them or by replacing the old ones by altogether new rules. But it is to be noted that due consideration was always given to the ideals of monastic life when the rules were being thus complied with.

Though the main requirements of the life of a Jaina monk were the same as that of a Buddhist, *viz.* food, abode, clothing and medicine, still a term like *nissaya* (of the Buddhist sources) to denote them inclusively is a *desideratum* in the Jaina sources. Besides, the Jaina monks as they believed in non-possession and insisted on bodily mortification so the very objectives which led to the sanction of these articles were considerably different from that of the Buddhists. This basic difference gave rise to a technique of promulgation of the monastic laws so peculiar to the Jainas. Thus any restriction however severe for them onks and disagreeable to the society it might have been, once imposed upon the brotherhood was very rarely abrogated or amended. Instead, it was made from severe to severer and severer to severest. Thus we would see in the coming pages that the ideal of non-possession culminated in its severest form as nudity, the purity of food gave rise to hair-splitting rules, and the quest for a suitable abode for the monks was made a huge task.

---

[1] appasannānaṁ vā pasādāya pasannānaṁ va bhiyyobhāvāya.

[2] *MV*, 2. 1. 1, p. 105.

[3] Ibid, 3. 1. 1, p. 144.

[4] Ibid, 3. 10. 21, p. 159.

[5] Ibid, 1. 61. 118, p. 93.

Now the four resources of the monks will be studied one by one.

(a) Piṇḍiyālopabhojana

We have just seen that the first and foremost requisite of a monk belonging either to the Buddhist or to the Jaina Order was food. In the beginning both of them used food gathered from begging-tours alone. The use of such food was called *piṇḍiyālopabhojana* by the first and *goyarabhoyaṇa* by the latter. Our study would reveal that the Buddhists due to various reasons relaxed the strictness of the rule without any loss of time, while the Jainas not only retained the strictness but made it even more austre by imposing several other restrictions upon the various aspects of food.

(i) *The nature of food allowed to the mendicants*

In both the systems the nature and purity of food have been discussed in great details. *Tikoṭiparisuddha*[1], i.e. free from the faults of being seen, heard or suspected as unacceptable; '*navakoḍiparisuddha*'[2], i.e. free from any injury to sentient beings, cooking or buying the food oneself, etc.; '*dasadosavivajjiya*'[3], i.e. free from the tenfold faults such as suspecting the purity of food, etc.; and '*uggamuppāyaṇesaṇāsuparisuddha*'[4], i.e. free from the forty-two faults pertaining to the nature and aim and method of preparation of food, the ways and

---

1. na, bhikkhave, jānaṁ uddesa-kataṁ maṁsaṁ paribhuñjitabbaṁ. yo paribhuñjeyya āpatti dukkaṭassa. anujānāmi, bhikkhave, tikoṭipari suddhaṁ macchamaṁsaṁ--adiṭṭhaṁ asutaṁ aparisaṅkitaṁ ti--*MV*, 6. 19.35, p. 253; *CV*, 7. 9. 14, pp. 298f.
2. samaṇeṇaṁ bhagavatā mahāvīreṇaṁ samaṇāṇaṁ ṇiggaṁṭhāṇaṁ ṇava-koḍiparisuddhe bhikkhe paṇattā taṁjahā—na haṇai na haṇāvaī haṇaṁtaṁ ṇāṇujāṇai ṇa patati ṇa patāveti pataṁtaṁ ṇāṇujāṇati ṇa kiṇati ṇa kiṇāveti kiṇaṁtaṁ ṇāṇujaṇati.—*Ṭhān*, 681, p. 452 a.
3. *Ṭhān*, 743, p. 492 a.
4. *Uttar*, 24. 12.

means adopted in the acquisition of food, and the ways of offering and accepting it are some of the terms often used in point, which will be explained in due course.

In both the systems monks were asked not to take recourse to any worldly arts and crafts for their livelihood. As such food acquired by raking messages, going on errands or acting as go-betweens (*duteyyapahiṇagamanānuyogaṁ anuyuttā*); by playing tricks (*kuhanā*), speaking indistinct words to gain something desired (*lapanā*) or by jugglery (*nippesikatā*); by prognostigations like palmistry (*aṅganimittaṁ*), interpretation of omens and sciences (*uppātaṁ*) or of dreams (*supiṇaṁ lakkhaṇaṁ*) or the like; by performing sacrifices or oblations to gods, etc ; by curing harms caused by demons (*bhūtavijjā*) or snake-bite, etc.; by bird-craft (*sakuṇavijjā*); by foretelling the health or luck of the owner of gems and weapons, etc. ; by astrological forecasts like the possibility of lunar or solar eclipse, fall of meteors, earthquake, etc. ; by making poems (*kāveyyaṁ*) or fixing lucky days for marriages, etc. ; by applying charms to make people lucky or unlucky, to cause abortion or to bring on any physical disability ; by showing other magical arts, etc.; and by curing persons through medicine or surgical operations were deemed unsuitable to the Buddhists.[1] So also, to acquire food by virtue of one's previous profession was also unbeseeming to them. Lord Buddha when he came to know that a monk, previously a barber had asked his sons to procure food for him and his Order, he rebuked him badly.[2]

This type of prohibitions to be followed by a Jaina monk, already referred to as *uppāyaṇadosa* were sixteen in number. Accordingly a monk must not use food obtained by acting as a nurse (*dhāī*); taking meassages, going on errands or acting as go-betweens (*dūī*); exploiting one's previous caste, family or profession (*ājīva*); posing as a beggar (*vaṇīmaga*); acting as a physician or a surgeon (*tigicchā*); making people afraid of one's power to invoke bad luck on them (*koha*); asserting pride for one's ability (*māṇa*); deceiving (*māyā*); showing greed for something (*lobha*); praising (*santhava*); magical arts (*vijjā* and *manta*); influencing people by the application of some powder or ointment (*cuṇṇa* and *joga*); and advising people regarding marriages, causing impregnation or abortion (*mūlakamma*).[3]

---

[1] *DN*, Vol. I, pp. 7-12 ; *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Vol. I, pp. 6-26.

[2] *MV*, 6.24.45, pp. 262-63.

[3] *PindN*, 410-512, pp 121b-145b.

Though meal for the Order, food for appointed persons, invitations, food allotted by tickets, fortnightly meals, food served on the *uposatha* days and on the first day of each fortnight—together called as *atirekalābha* (i. e. extra-allowances)[1], were allowed to the Buddhist monks, yet a monk in health was not allowed

(a) to take more than one meal at a public rest-house (*āvasatha-piṇḍa*);[2]

(b) to take meal with persons more than three together (*gaṇabhojana*), except in cases of gift, preparation of robes, journey on foot or by boat, great influx of monks and general invitation;[3]

(c) to enjoy meal in turn (*paramparābhojana*), except on the occasions of gift and preparation of robes;[4]

(d) to accept food with his own hand in families declared lay-devotees under discipline (*sekhasammatānikulāni*);[5]

(e) to enjoy food at his own house (*ajjhārāme*) without previous notice, even though he was a forest-dweller;[6] and

(f) to accept a standing invitation pertaining to requisites for more than a period of four months, if not invited again[7].

It may however be noted that the remaining forty-two faults pertaining to preparation (*uggama*) and acquisition of food (*esaṇā*) by the Jaina monks were peculiarly their own. It would not be out of place to point out that the nature of some of these faults were directly opposed to some of the aforesaid rules of the Buddhists. These faults, respectively sixteen and ten in number[8], were incurred by accepting food—which involved injury to living beings[9], prepared purposely for a monk or anybody else,[1] kept in an unclean pot, prepared with double purpose, placed in unclean regions or changed in nature because of being preserved specially for monks, offered to a monk like a guest, exposed to light, purchased specially for monks, borrowed or bought on credit, brought on exchange for some other articles,[2] brought from a long distance to monks' residence, given after opening a jar or a door, brought from a high place,[3] taken by force from others, given without the consent of all the owners of food,[4] and food with anything added to it in the presence of monks (16); and food of doubtful purity, given with a pot or a hand soiled with objectionable articles,[5] placed on living beings, given after opening the lid, etc.[6], brought from a distance,[7] given by unfit donors, mixed with living beings,[8] given without the permission of any of the owners of food,[9] besmeared with liquid, and food some portion of which would have fallen down on the ground when being served[10] (10).[11]

---

[1] *MV*, 1. 22. 73, p. 55.

[2] *PM*, 5. 31.

[3] Ibid, 5. 32.

[4] *PM*, 5.33.

[5] Ibid, 6.3.

[6] Ibid, 6 4.

[7] Ibid, 6 47.

[8] āhākam muddesiya puikamme ya mīsajāe ya/
ṭhavaṇā pāhuḍiyāe pāoara kīya pāmicce//
pariyattie abhihaḍe ubhinne mālohaḍe ya/
acchijje aṇisaṭṭhe ajjhoyarae ya solasame// *PindN*, 92-93, p.34.
saṁkiya makkhiya nikkhitta pihiya sāhariya dāyagummise/
apariṇaya litta chaḍḍiya esaṇadosā dasa havanti// *PindN*, 520, p. 147a.

[9] *Āyār* (*SBE* Vol. XXII), 2.1.9 (p. 111).

It is however evident from the list of faults just referred to that the Jainas intended to avoid public condemnation, any injury to living beings and any harm or inconvenience to themselves as well as to donors. This intention of the Jainas finally emerged in the justification of donors. Accordingly a child below eight years (*bāla*), an old person (*vuḍḍha*), a drunken man (*matta*), a mad man (*ummatta*), a shaky person (*thevira*), a feverish person (*jaria*), a blind person (*andhillaa*), a leper (*pagaria*), person wearing wooden sandals (*ārūḍha*), one whose hands were bound (*hatthindu*), one whose feet were bound with fetters (*niyalabaddha*), a person devoid of some limbs (*vivajjia*), a eunuch (*terāsi*), a pregnant woman (*guvviṇī*), a woman with breast-fed child (*bālavacchā*),[12] a woman taking meals (*bhuñjantī*), a woman churning curds (*ghusulintī*), or a woman doing any household work like frying, pounding, and grinding, a woman indulging in activities involving injury to living being like depositing living beings on the ground, stepping over them, etc and a man or a woman offering food unsuitable to monks because of his or her faulty action, were deemed unfit to offer anything to a monk.[1]

---

[1] *Āyār* (*SBE*, Vol. XXII, (1.6.8 (p. 104); *Dasv*, 5-1,55.

[2] *Dasv*, 5-1.55; 6 49-50

[3] Ibid, 5-1. 65-69.

[4] Ibid, 5-1. 37.

[5] Ibid, 5-1. 32-34; *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 1. 6. 4-6 (pp. 103-104).

[6] Ibid, 5-1. 45-46.

[7] Ibid, 5-1. 55.

[8] Ibid, 5-1. 31.

[9] Ibid, 5-1. 37.

[10] Vide, *Supra*, p. 112.

[11] Vide *Dasā*, 2ndd *asā*.

[12] *Dasv*, 5-1.37-44; *PindN*, 527-604, pp. 157b-164b.

Along with these, the owner of the house occupied by the monks (*sejjāyara*),[2] persons living under his protection,[3] members of royal families,[4] and persons of a blamed (*duguñchia*) and censured (*gārahia*) families,[5] excepting poor families,[6] should not be approached for food. Thus a monk should accept food only "from unblamed (*aduguñchia*), uncensured (*agārahia*) families, to wit, noble families (*uggakula,*), distinguished families (*bhogakula*), royal families (*rāiṇṇakula),* families belonging to the line of Ikṣvāku, of Hari, Cowherds' families, Vaiśya families, barbers' families, carpenters' families, *takurs*' families and weavers' families".[7] Thus it is clear that the members of royal families, while at one place, are deemed fit for offering food to the monks, are also enumerated among the unfit donors at other.

On the contrary, the Buddhist Church was not so much cautious concerning the fitness or otherwise of donors. However a donor intervened by a nun before he had undertaken the thing to give to the monk,[8] a person offering food after he had been exhorted,[9] a nun acting as a donor,[10] a person intending to cause any harm to the monks,[11] the families that had been declared lay-devotees under discipline (*sekhasammatāni kulāni*)[12] and a monk who had already begged with a view to give to the monks[13] were disqualified to do so.

(ii) Proper and improper articles of food and drink

The Buddhist monks are often referred to have used rice-gruel (*yāgu*) as their ordinary food. The Jaina sources do not furnish us with this sort of details as the Jaina monks ate simply whatever they obtained in begging. Therefore to make any definite assertion

---

1. *Dasv*, 5-1. 37-44; *PindN*, 572-604, pp. 157b-164b.
2. Ibid, 3. 5; *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 2. 3. 4 (p.131); *Bṛhk*, 2. 19-28; *Bhag*, 210, p. 231a (*sejjāyarapiṁḍa*); *Dasv*, 3.5 (*sāgāriyapiṁḍa*).
3. *Bṛhk*, 2. 14-18.
4. *Āyār (SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.1.3.10 (p. 97); *Nis*, 9. 4-5.
5. Ibid, 2. 1. 2. 2 (p. 92); *Nis*, 16. 27; *Dasv*, 3. 3.
6. *Dasv*, 5-2. 25.
7 *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 1. 2. 2 (p. 92).
8. *PM*, 5. 29.
9. *KN*, Vol. I, *Suttanipāta*, 1. 4. 81, p. 82.
10. *PM*, 6. 1.
11. *CV*, 8. 9. 23, p. 214; Vide *Vinaya Texts* (*SBE*. Vol. XX), p. 119. fn2.
12. *PM*, 6. 3.
13. *MV*, 6. 25. 45, pp. 262-63.

pertaining to articles of food which might have formed the main items of their meal will be misleading.

Normally a healthy monk was forbidden to beg for his own use the delicacies (*paṇitabhojanāni*), namely, ghee, butter, oil, honey, molasses, fish, flesh and curds,[1] but a free use of ghee, butter, oil, honey and molasses,[2] often referred to as five kinds of medicine (*pañca bhesajjāni*) was sanctioned to the Buddhists on the ground of medicine. Besides, any preparation from molasses and honey, and the five products of the cow—milk, curd, butter-milk, butter and ghee, were also allowed to the monks for their use.[3] Only a sick person was permitted to ask for a special menu of food like curry or rice for one's own use.[4]

The rules as regards proper and improper articles of food given by different Jaina texts seem to be a bit inconsistent. The *Ācārāṅga-sūtra*[5] deems it improper to take ghee, liquor, molasses, oil, honey, etc.; while the *Kalpasūtra*[6] allows the nine *vikṛtis*, namely, milk, sour-milk, fresh butter, clarified butter, oil, sugar, honey, liquor and meat. Similary the *Ācārāṅgasūtra*[7] considers it fit and suitable to a monk to take water used for washing sesamum, chaff or barley, or rain water, or sour-gruel (*soviraṁ*), or pure water; while the *Daśavaikālikasūtra*[8] forbids these articles of drink. The justification pleaded by the *Piṇḍaniryukti*[9] for not permitting a monk to use ghee, curds, etc. is that these are *leva* or besmearing things. The monks however are prescribed *yavāgu*, *takka* (butter-milk), *kaṁji* and curry as these are considered *appaleva*, while they are advised to discard ghee, curds, molasses, etc. because these are *bahuleva*. Another justification for the use of butter-milk is that it is useful for indigestion.

Thus it is evident that the Jainas tried to use dry food only. But even dry food like barley-powder (*sattucuṇṇa*), jujube-powder (*kolacuṇṇa*), sesamum-cake (*sakkuli*), etc. was deemed unfit for a monk, if placed for sale or covered with dust,[10] while a Buddhist used preparation from kidney-bean (*mugga*)[1] and flour eatables (*piṭṭhakhādaniya*)[2] without any restriction.

---

[1] *PM*, 5. 39.
[2] *MV*, 6. 1. 1, p. 218.
[3] Ibid, 6. 22. 41, p. 258.
[4] *CV*, 8. 5. 9, p. 308.
[5] *Op. cit.*, 2. 1. 8. 8 (pp. 109-110).
[6] *Op. cit.*, pp. 297-98; *Ṭhān*, 674, p. 450b.
[7] *Op. cit.*, 2. 1. 7. 8 (pp. 107-108).
[8] *Op. cit.*, 5-1. 75.
[9] *Op. cit.*, 622-25, pp. 168a-168b.
[10] *Dasv*, 5-1. 71-72.

Though the Buddhists were allowed a free use of fruits, roots and eatable-herbs (*ḍāka*),[3] yet the use of fruits that had been injured by fire, weapons or nails; or that had seeds not yet ripe to sprout (*abījaṁ*); or that had dropped seeds (*nibbattabījaṁ*) was deemed more suitable to them[4]. So far as the Jaina monks were concerned, they were expressly asked not to take bulbs (*kanda*), roots (*mūla*), fruits and green vegetables in general and wet-cucumber (*tumbāga*), ginger, *astika* fruit, *tinduka* fruit, *bilva*, sugarcane and *simbali* fruit in particular.[5]

Besides the aforesaid food, some drinks were also sanctioned to the Buddhist monks which were as below :

a. ten kinds of syrup prepared from mango, *jambu*, banana, *moca* fruit (?), honey, grape, edible root of the water-lili and *phārusaka;*

b. syrup prepared from all leaves but potherbs (*ḍākarasaṁ*);

c. syrup prepared from all flowers but liquorice (*madhukapuppharasaṁ*);

d. juice prepared from all fruits but from corn (*dhaññaphalarasaṁ*);

e. juice of sugarcane (*ucchurasa*);[6]

f. sugar-water (*guḷodaka*);[7]

g. salted-sour-gruel (*loṇasovīraka*);[8] and

h. water as beverage (*udakasambhinnaṁ*)[9].

It has already been opined that the Jainas were averse to liquid food. Thanks to the farsightedness of framers of the laws who granted suitable exceptions to this general law. Thus their advice to the

---

1. *MV*, 6 4. 13, p. 228.
2. Ibid, 6. 24. 44, p. 262.
3. Ibid.
4. *CV*, 5. 2. 8, p. 198.
5. *Dasv*, 5-2. 18-24; *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 1. 8. 1-15 (pp. 108-110).
6. *MV*, 6. 23. 42, p. 260.
7. Ibid, 6. 13. 25, p. 242.
8. The word *loṇasovīraka* is interpreted as salted-sour-gruel (vide *Pali English Dictionary*). It seems to be a drink prepared from *takka* (butter-milk), *loṇa* (salt) and fried *jīraka* (cummin-seed), known as *jiramānī* in modern dialects like Magahī, Bhojapurī, etc. It is also useful for the stomach.
9. *MV*, 6. 4. 14, p. 228.

monks to avoid drinks too costly or too cheep was manifested in the injunction to reject cheep drinks like brown-sugar-wash (*vāradhovana*)[1] and recent rice-wash (*cāulodaga*)[2]. Besides they were also forbidden from drinking cold water.[3]

Eating of meat or fish was however allowed to the Buddhist. Only an inquiry, whether it had been prepared specially to be served to the monks, was to be made before taking it.[4] If it was seen or heard or suspected to be so, then it was deemed unacceptable to them.[5] Besides, flesh of man and such animals as elephant, horse, dog, serpent, lion, tiger, bear, and hyena was not to be taken by the monks.[6]

The Jaina Canonical texts bear ample evidence[7] to show that meat-eating or fish-eating was in practice among the early Jaina monks. The commentators[8] as they considered it opposed to the vow of non-violence tried their best to obliterate it for ever by giving an altogether new interpretation to the terms and phrases standing for flesh (*maṁsa*), bone (*aṭṭhī*), etc. It is really surprising that even some of the modern scholars have started thinking in the same line and have even accepted the explanation put forward by the commentators. The only argument forwarded by them in support of their contention is that the idea of non-vegetarian diet is not in harmony with the spirit

---

1. Probably *vāradhovana* was a kind of drink prepared from the wash (*dhovana*) of the remains left in the pan at the end of the turn (*vāra*) of a farmer making molasses or brown-sugar from the juice of sugarcane. This type of drink known as *dhoya* (= *dhovana*, wash) is still in use in the sugarcane growing areas of Bihar.
2. *Dasv*, 5-1. 75.
3. Ibid, 5-2. 22; 10. 2; *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 1. 7. 7 (p. 107); 2. 6. 2. 1-2. (pp. 169-70).
4. *MV*, 6. 9. 21, p. 235.
5. Vide *Supra*, p. 112.
6. *MV*, 6. 10. 22, pp 235-36.
7. se jaṁ puṇa jāṇijjā, bahuaṭṭhieṇa maṁseṇa vā bahukaṇṭagaṁ macchena vā assiṁ khalu paḍigāhivaṁsi appesiyā bhoyaṇajāe bahuujjhiyadhammie-tahappagāraṁ bahuaṭṭhiyaṁ maṁsaṁ vā bahukaṇṭagaṁ macchaṁ vā labhe saṁte jāva ṇo paḍigāhijjā.—*Āyār*, 2. 1. 10. 5-6; vāsāvāsaṁ pajjosaviyāṇaṁ no kappai niggaṁṭṭhīṇaṁ niggaṁṭṭhīṇaṁ vā haṭṭhāṇaṁ tuṭṭhāṇaṁ āroggāṇaṁ baliyasarīrāṇaṁ imāo nava rasavigaīo abhikkhaṇaṁ abhikkhaṇaṁ āhārittae taṁ jahā-khīraṁ, dahiṁ, navanīyaṁ, sappiṁ, tillaṁ, guḍaṁ, mahuṁ, majjaṁ, maṁsaṁ.—*Kalp* (*Sāmācārī*), *Sūtra* 17; revatie gāhāvatiṇie mamaṁ aṭṭhāe......, atthi se aṇṇe pariyāsie majjāra-kaḍae kukkuḍamaṁsae tamāharāhi eeṇaṁ attho...*Bhag*, 557, p. 1261a; bahuaṭṭhiyaṁ poggalaṁ aṇimisaṁ vā bahukaṁṭayaṁ,—*Dasv*, 5-1. 73.
8. Vide *Bhag*, p. 1270b.

of Jainism, the staunch advocate of *ahiṁsā*. But as a matter of fact the explanation is purely misleading, firstly because nowhere in the whole of Indian literature such explanation of the terms and phrases concerned is to be traced out, and secondly to seek out pure vegetarian food was an impossibility for the early monks, and thirdly to eat meat or fish not prepared for their sake was normally not regarded as violence The Buddhists were perhaps allowed non-vegetarian food because of the latter two reasons. The right explanation, therefore, is that that non-vegetarian diet was also in vogue among the early Jaina monks which fell into abeyance in due course. But the Jaina insistence on the prohibition of food prepared for self (*auddesika*) points to the fact that the prohibition under question related to non-vegetarian food prepared for monks. The Buddhists also did not accept non-vegetarian food prepared for themselves. The concept of *auddesika* food was perhaps originally concerned with non-vegetarian food prepared for monks, and the concept was common to both the Buddhists and the Jainas, which however acquired a general importance and wider application to all kinds of food in the Jaina Church.

Moreover, the Jainas believe that even living vegetables have souls and they are to be ranked equally with living animals and this is also endorsed by Manu. The vegetable kingdom and the animal kingdom have got the same status so far as fundamental vitality and physical functions are concerned. The difference is one of degree and not of kind. A Jaina monk does not partake of even fruits or leaves unless they are boiled and reduced to dead matter. They take these boiled food-stuff from householders subject to the restrictions noted. If meat can be made extinct of life like vegetable, the eating of it should not logically speaking be incompatible with the vow of non-violence. Meat-eating however is anathema to the Jaina, Vaiṣṇava and particular sections of the Hindu community. The reason for this distinction seems to be derived from the horror of blood-shed and distressful reactions of animals after slaughter. If so the ban on animal food is due to physical and emotional reaction and not logical consideration.

(iii) *The Begging-bowl*

The most significant thing which was closely associated with food and drink was the begging-bowl. The Buddhists called it *patta*[1],

---

[1] *MV*, 1. 6. 12, p. 12; 1. 18. 66, p. 44; 1. 19. 67, p. 48; 1. 23. 78, p. 58; etc.; *CV*, 8. 11. 21, p. 328; etc.

bhājana[1] or sometimes *bhaṇḍa*[2], and the Jainas *pāya* (*pātra* or *pāda*)[3], *bhāyaṇa*[4] or *paḍiggaha*[5]. Numerous rules were framed concerning the materials out of which it should be made, its use and the way of its preservation, etc.

It may however be remarked that the very conception of monachism starts with the abandonement of the use of valuable and gorgeous things as it was considered an obstacle to monastic life. As such the use of bowls made of costly metals and beautiful shell or horn was not permissible to the monks whether they belonged to the Jaina Church or the Buddhist Order. The Jainas particularly avoided a bowl made out of iron (*aya*), tin (*tāu*), lead (*sisaga*), silver (*hiraṇṇa*), gold (*suvaṇṇa*), brass (*ririya*), a mixture of gold, silver and copper (*hārapuḍa*), pearl (*maṇi*), glass (*kāca*), bell-metal (*kaṁsa*), horn (*siṅga*), ivory (*danta*), cloth (*cela*), stone (*sela*) or leather (*camma*) and a pot decorated with any one of these materials.[6] The Buddhists agreed with the Jainas as they also discarded a pot made either from wood (*dāru*), gold (*sovaṇṇa*), silver (*rupiya*), pearl (*maṇi*), beryl (*veluriya*), crystal (*phalika*), bell-metal (*kaṁsa*), glass (*kāca*), tin (*tipu*), lead (*sīsa*), copper (*tambaloha*)[7], or bronze (*loha*)[8].

If the Jainas did not use a pot used by the householders[9] and a pot bought purposely for them[10], the Buddhists disliked a pot painted with beautiful figures and linings[11]. Along with these, the use of bowls made out of gourd (*tumbakaṭāha*), turtle-shell (*ghaṭikaṭāha*) and human skull (*chavasīsapatta*) was banned in the Buddhist Order on account of their use among the heretics.[12]

It is to be noted that the Jainas used bowls made either of gourd (*lāu*), or of wood (*dāru*), or of clay (*maṭṭiyā*),[13] while the Buddhists those made from iron (*aya*) or clay (*mattikā*)[14].

---

1. *MV*, 1 18 66, p. 41; 1. 19. 67, p 48; 1. 23. 78, p. 58; etc.; *CV*, 8. 11. 21, p. 328; etc.
2. *CV*, 5. 18 52, p 233.
3. *Ṭhān*, 170, p. 138a; *Nis*, 5 64.
4. *Bhag*, 111, p. 139a.
5. *Nāyā*, p. 29; *Dasv*, 5-2. 1; *Nis*, 5. 65.
6. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 6. 1. 1-3 (pp. 166-67); *Dasv*, 6. 51-53.
7. *CV*, 5. 5. 10, p. 201.
8. Ibid, 5. 13. 35, p. 225.
9. *Dasv*, 6. 53; *Suyg* (*SBE*. Vol. XLV), p. 304.
10. Ibid, 6. 51-53; *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2 6. 1, 13 (pp. 166-67).
11. *CV*, 5. 5.11, pp. 201-202.
12. Ibid, 5. 5. 13, pp. 203-204.
13. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 6. 1. 1 (p. 166); *Ṭhān*, 170, p. 138a; *Nis*, 1. 39; 5. 64; *Bṛhk*, 5. 41f.
14. *CV*, 5. 5. 10, p. 201.

In spite of the fact that keeping extra bowl was normally prohibited, the Buddhists were allowed to hold an extra bowl for not more than a period of ten days,[1] whereas the Jainas could do so only with the permission of the owner[2] or in case of some deficiency[3]. Besides, both to replace an old bowl by a new one, if it was broken in less than five places[4] and to hide or to cause any one to hide other's bowl[5] were taken as faults. Normally no exchange[6] or transaction[7] concerning pot was sanctioned to a Jaina monk. But they could give it to a novice, male or female or to an old monk or nun, unable to procure it himself or herself.[8]

The Buddhists as well as the Jainas were often warned to use their begging-bowls cautiously. The former was forbidden to keep their bowls with water in them; or to dry them in the sunshine with water in them; or to put away in a warm place or at the edge of the sleeping-benches or *paribhaṇḍa*; or to leave them in the open air; or turning upside down on the ground; or to hang up on pins in the walls; or to put down on bed, chair, in their laps or on the sunshed (*chatta*);[9] or to open the doors with bowls in their hands,[10] so that their bowls might not be spoiled in any way. Likewise the latter was prohibited to expand the mouth of the pot (?), or to have more than three *tuṇḍiyas*, or to bind it improperly, or to give it only one or more than three ties (*bandha*), or to use a pot with many ties for more than a period of one and half months;[11] or to use unfit ones or unstable ones, or to discolour the coloured pot or *vice versa*, or to polish it with oil, ghee, butter, fat, powder or paint, or to wash it with hot or cold water, or to dry it at a place full of living beings[12].

The monks were also allowed some accessories of pot for its protection and preservation. A bag for the pot (*pattathavika*), a piece of string to bind the bag for the pot (*bandhanasuttaka*)[13] and a stand for

---

1. *PM*, 4. 21.
2. *Vav*, 8. 15.
3. *Nis*, 14. 6.
4. *PM*, 4. 22.
5. Ibid, 5. 60
6. *Nis*, 14. 1-4; 14. 5-7; 16. 25-29.
7. Ibid, 1. 39.
8. Ibid, 14. 7.
9. *CV*, 5. 5. 12, pp. 202-203.
10. Ibid, 5. 5. 13, p. 203.
11. *Nis*, 1. 41-45.
12. Ibid, 14. 8-45.
13. *CV*, 5. 5. 12, p. 203.

the pot (*malorika*[1] were some of the main accessories sanctioned to the Buddhists, and a piece of string to bind the pot (*pattabandha*), a coverlet for the pot (*paḍala*), a stand for the pot (*pāyaṭṭhavaṇa*), two pieces of cloth to be used as pot-cleanser and coverlet of the pot (*pāyapaḍilehaṇiā* and *gocchaga*) respectively[2] were the chief accessories allowed to the Jainas.

Besides these, the Jaina sources contain an elaborate details as regards the size, the quality and other aspects of an ideal pot.[3]

(*iv*) *The purpose of taking food*

Every religion lays stress upon the need of using a thing with pure intention. Naturally the Buddhist Church enjoined upon the monks to take food neither for sport, nor for sensual excess, nor for personal charm and adornment, but for the maintenance of the body, cessation of the pangs of hunger, as a help to celibacy, to appease the arisen feeling of hunger and to check the origination of new feeling, in brief to maintain life.[4]

Almost in the same way, the Jaina Order advised the ascetics to take food because of six reasons, namely, for the appeasement of the pangs of hunger, for rendering service to seniors and sick, for maintaining a proper mode of movement, for practising self-control, for maintaining life and for practising religion.[5]

Thus the reason for which the monks were allowed to take food by the Buddhists as well as by the Jainas were more or less the same, *viz.* to make them able to practise religion. It will not be improper to refer to the fact that the purpose of taking food was of prime importance as the quantity of food to be consumed by a monk seems to have been regulated by it.

---

1. *CV*, 5. 8. 22, p. 213.
2. *OghN*, 674-704, pp. 209a-213b.
3. Vide Ibid, 674-704, pp. 209a-213b; *HJM*, pp. 264-271.
4. patisaṅkhā yoniso piṇḍapātaṁ paṭisevati--'neva davāya, na madāya, na maṇḍanāya, na vibhuṣanāya, yāvadeva imassa kāyassa ṭhitiyā yāpanāya, vihiṁsuparatiyā, brahmacariyanuggahāya, iti purānaṁ ca vedanaṁ paṭihaṅkhāmi navaṁ ca vedanaṁ na uppādessāmi, yātrā ca me bhavissati anavajjatā ca phāsuvihāro ca.—*MN*, Vol. I, p. 15; Vide *DN*, Vol, I, pp. 62f which advises a monk to take as much food as is sufficient to keep one's stomach going.
5. veyaṇaveyāvacce īriyaṭṭhāe ya saṁjamaṭṭhāe. taha paṇavattiyāe chaṭṭhaṁ puṇa dhammaciṁtāe.--*Ṭhān*, 500, p. 359a; *OghN*, 579-582, pp. 188ab.

(*v*) *The quantity of food*

The Buddhists were not prescribed a definite quantity of food. They were simply advised to take as much food as was sufficient to keep their stomach going.[1] Likewise originally the Jainas were asked 'to beg food only for the sustenance of life'. However their normal diet was fixed to consist of thirty-two morsels (*kavala*), each equal to the size of a hen's egg (*kukkuḍiaṇḍapamāṇa*). But it is to be noted that those eating less than this ideal quantity were highly praised.[2] Later on the quantity of food to be consumed by a Jaina monk was regulated by several factors These factors in question were season,[3] the magnitude of fast, the number of donations (*dattis*) and the number of houses to be visited by a monk[4].

(*vi*) *The time for eating*

It is to be borne in mind that monks belonging to both the systems are normally allowed only one meal a day.[5] A Buddhist is expected to finish it before mid-day as both entering a village[6] and taking food out of hours,[7] i. e. from sun-turn in one day till sun-rise in the next, are strictly prohibited. On the contrary, a Jaina, in normal circumstances, is required to finish his meal in the third *porisī*.[8] But the time for taking food may also be adjusted according to one's own suitability when some special vow as regards food has been undertaken, and a monk under such circumstance may also beg alms for more than once a day.[9] Again it is a point worth noticing that a Jaina ascetic is in no case allowed a night-meal, i. e. to take food after sun-set in one day till sun-rise in the next (*khettātikkaṁta*).[10]

(*vii*) *The way of proceeding to the village for alms*

A strict course of discipline to be observed by a monk in course of begging of alms is laid down by both the systems. The Buddhists called it *piṇḍacārikavatta* and *bhattaggavatta* (the way of attending a

---

1. *DN*, Vol. I, pp. 62-63.
2. *Bhag*, 269, p. 292a; *Vav*, 8. 16; *PindN*, 612-45, pp. 173a-174a.
3. *OghN* 652, p. 204a.
4. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), pp. 298-301.
5. Ibid, pp. 298-299.
6. *PM*, 5. 85.
7. Ibid, 5. 37.
8. *Bhag*, 269, pp. 291b-292a.
9. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 299.
10. *Bhag*, 269, pp. 291b-292a,

community dinner), and the Jainas *bhatteṣaṇā* or *goyarī*. The reason alluded to the promulgation of these *vattas* by the first is said to have been the indecent behaviour of Chavaggiya monks.[1] They are often mentioned to have misbehaved with the monks both senior as well as junior and to have gone to the village clad improperly. The Jaina Order, on the other hand, seems to have framed the rules before any instance of the kind came to the force. Any further remark in point before giving a detailed account of the rules concerned will be incorrect and unjustified.

After having been informed about the meal-time, the Buddhist monks clad properly and provided with the begging-bowl, proceeded to the village slowly and carefully with downcast eyes. They avoided at all cost pushing their way on in front of the seniors, or proceeding to the village with disordered robes, or with long laughter or with swaying limbs, or putting hands on the hips, or with covered head, or with unusual gait, or fickle-minded looking to and fro. So also, they tried not to encroach on the seniors or to debar a junior from a seat or to spread their upper-robes as a mat when taking seat in the house of the donor.[2]

In course of begging, nobody was allowed to force one's way into a house where a meal was going on or to take a seat there in order to enjoy the meal. Anybody wishing to go inside a house for alms should do so after a due examination of the way to go in and to come out. If entered inside, one should stay there at a considerable distance from the householder for a considerable period of time If there was any hope of getting alms, then one should wait there and should receive it with downcast eyes.[3]

Likewise the Jaina monks set out for begging alms outfitted with all their requisites.[4] As a rule, nobody was allowed to go on begging when there was heavy rain, thick and strong mist, high and dusty wind, or a large number of insects flying in the sky.[5] The Jinakalpika monks, unlike the Sthavirakalpikas who collected alms even in light rain, observed it strictly as they refrained from begging even if there was a fine spray of rain.[6] Normally the monks collected alms in pairs or in groups[1] moving slowly, unexcited and without any haste[2] looking forward upto the distance of the yoke of a cart in order to avoid any injury even to vegetable-beings[3]. In case the road was feared to be full of difficulties and dangers, then instead of going straight, they were allowed to follow another way, if there was any.[4] Nobody was to make the entrance of the house of a householder passable without his previous permission;[5] or to wait at the door of a house being visited by mendicants or beggars;[6] or to enter or to leave the house of a householder with heretics or householders[7].

---

[1] *CV*, 8. 5. 8, p. 317.

[2] Ibid, 8. 5. 9, pp. 317-18; 8. 6. 11, p. 320; *PM*, 7. 1-26.

[3] Ibid, 8. 6. 11, pp. 320-21.

[4] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 1. 3. 6 (p. 96).

[5] Ibid, 2. 1. 3. 9 (pp. 96-97); *Dasv*, 5-1. 8.

[6] *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 301.

Thus moving out for alms, nobody was permitted to tell any story to the householders or to take a seat amidst them or even to stand by taking the help of a pillar or the panels of the door or the door itself.[8] In this way, a monk in search of one's alms could go upto a distance of half a *yojana*[9] in dry seasons and a *yojana* and a *krosa*[10] in the rainy season from one's residence.

Normally both the Buddhist and the Jaina monks were asked to beg at all houses without any consideration of the status of their inhabitants.[11] The Jainas, however, were allowed to visit noble families only, so that they might collect pure and admissible food conveniently.[12] As such they were strictly forbidden from seeking alms at the houses of courtesans and other impious families and even at the houses of kings and high officials as they were feared to offer a preparation of forbidden articles of food or to cause trouble.[13]

In this way, a monk should move for alms among high and low families and should never go to a rich family leaving aside poor one.[14] Moreover he should call on a donor when he, along with the

---

1. *OghN*, 411, p. 147b.
2. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 1. 5. 1 (p. 99).
3. *Dasv*, 5-1. 2-3.
4. Ibid, 5-1. 3-16; *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 1. 5. 2-4 (pp. 90-101); 2. 1. 6. 1 (pp. 102-103); Vide *Infra*, pp. 17-19.
5. Ibid, 5-1. 22-25; *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 1. 6. 2 (p. 103).
6. Ibid, 5-2. 10-11.
7. *Āyār* (*SBE* Vol. XXII), 2. 1. 1. 9 (p. 90); 2. 1. 5. 1 (p. 99); 2. 1. 5. 6 (p. 102).
8. Ibid, 2. 1. 6. 2 (p. 103); *Dasv*, 5-2, 8-9.
9. Ibid, 2 1. 2. 5 (p. 93); *Bhag*, 269, pp. 291b-292a.
10. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 297.
11. *Dasv*, 5-1. 14; *PM*, 7. 33.
12. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 1. 2. 2 (p. 92).
13. Ibid, 2. 1. 3. 10 (p. 97); *Dasv*, 5-1. 10-11; 5-1. 16-17; *Nis*, 9. 4-5.
14. *Dasv*, 5-2. 25.

members of his family, would have finished meal and other household works.[1]

(viii) *The way of receiving food*

The Buddhists, particularly when enjoying a community dinner, were enjoined to receive food in their bowls after washing them with the water served before the meal and not to disturb the person serving the meal in any way. Accordingly they were advised to receive food with downcast eyes looking straight at the bowl. So also, they were asked not to receive food overflowing the bowl or with improportionate curry (or soup) or to cover up the delicacies or to ask for a particular menu for one's use.[2]

The Jainas as a rule did not wash their bowl before receiving food in it. They accepted alms having full control over their senses. Besides, they were much cautious regarding the purity of the donor, his or her way and intention of offering and the purity of food.[3]

As a Buddhist, so a Jaina is advised to receive as much food as one considers sufficient for one's stomach. In this connection it is worth noticing that the Buddhists do not appear to have prescribed a definite quantity of food to be taken by an ideal monk as the Jainas seem to have done. Thus the normal quantity of food to be taken by a Jaina monk is thirty-two morsels.[4] Receiving food more than required or less than needed purposely is however deemed a sinful act by the Buddhists.

(ix) *The process of eating food*

As in the case of going, so also in coming back from an invitation or begging, a monk was required to observe perfect discipline. A person coming first from the begging round was obliged to open the service hall *(upaṭṭhānasālā)* and arrange it with the necessary articles like seats, water for washing feet and foot-stool, etc. Then one could eat the food if so desired.[5]

Dining or drinking in one vessel like householders was not allowed to the mendicants.[6] When eating food, it was unworthy

---

1. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 1. 4. 3 (p. 98).
2. *CV*, 8. 5-9, p. 318; 8. 6. 11, p. 320.
3. *Dasv*, 5-1. 27-81.
4. Vide *Supra*, p. 122.
5. *CV*, 8. 6. 11, p, 321.
6. Ibid, 5. 8. 22, p. 213.

of a monk to press the food from the top; or to look at other's bowl with greed and eagerness; or to make a very large mouthful; or to open the mouth before the mouthful has come close to it; or to put the whole hand into the mouth; or to talk with food in the mouth; or to toss the food in the mouth; or to bite the food playfully; or to stuff the cheeks with food; or to shake hands about; or to scatter lumps of rice; or to put out the tongue; or to smack lips: or to make a hissing sound: or to lick fingers, bowls or the lips; or to chew the food placing outside the door of the mouth; etc. Likewise holding water-vessel with hands soiled with food was strictly prohibited. After eating, the bowls and hands were to be rinsed well and with due care [1]

Even a *thera*, on the eve of an invitation, is neither allowed to eat before the food has been served out to all nor to rinse his bowls and hands, if taking of food is still going on. Besides, eating out of one dish or drinking out of one vessel is prohibited. But at the same time monks are advised to use even the fallen food, if fallen at the time of service.

The community dinner is concluded with the act of thanks-giving to the donor by the monks. The senior most member, as a rule, is entrusted with this duty. Others too are obliged to wait there until the act of thanks-giving has been finished. If not so, then at least four or five senior members are bound to stay. Anybody intending to leave the place is allowed to do so after informing the monk or nun next to him or her in seniority.[2]

This procedure of visiting a community dinner is completely reflected in the well-born way of attending an invitation by the Buddha. To make the point intelligible, let us produce it *verbatim.*

' "And in the forenoon the Blessed One, having put on the under-robes took his alms-bowl, and, with his *cīvara* on went to the house of the lay-devotee. When he had arrived there, he sat down with the *bhikkhus* who followed him, on seats laid out for them. Then that lay-devotee served and offered with his own hands excellent food, both hard and soft, to the fraternity of *bhikkhus* with the Buddha at its head. And when the Blessed One had finished his meal, and cleansed his bowl and his hands, that lay-devotee sat down near him. And the

---

[1] *CV*, 5. 8. 22, p. 213.

[2] Ibid, 8. 5. 9, pp. 318-19; *PM*, 7. 27-56.

Blessed One, after having taught, incited, animated and gladdened that lay-devotee by religious discourse, rose from his seat and went away."[1]

So much about the Buddhist way of taking food. The Jainas too like the Buddhists, were asked to come back to their residence with perfect self-control. They, first of all after their arrival to the residence, were advised to seek out a place fit for eating food and to clean it. Then, going to the preceptor they were required to perform the *iriyāpatha* rite before him and to show him the contents of their bowls. Usually they were to wait till others' arrival and to dine their food with fellow-monks, if anybody was ready to partake their food.

If anybody, while on begging-tour wanted to dine, then he must seek out a lonely place like the side of a wall, etc. Then after seeking the permission of the owner, he should clean it and then eat the food carefully.

If while eating he comes across a piece of bone or a blade of grass or a pebble or the like, then he is to place it in a corner gently and perform the *pratikramaṇa*. In no case a monk is allowed to make a hissing sound or to smack lips or to eat too slowly or too quickly.[2]

Thus so far as the discipline to be observed at the time of eating is concerned, the Buddhists and the Jainas, besides some negligible differences, stand on the same footing. Both are commonly advised to return to their residence with perfect self-control, to arrange the dining place, to wait for their friends' arrival and to eat food decorously.

(x) *Storing up articles of food*

Morsels of food gathered from begging-tours being the cardinal principle of the Buddhist mendicants, storing up articles of food received as gifts, etc. or cooking food inside the monastery, in normal circumstances, was unbecoming to them. Such practices, therefore, were permissible to them in days of scarcity only,[3] for no sooner the alms were available in abundance than the privilege was denied to them[4]. But very soon the multiplication of the members of the Order and the introduction of corporate life in a settled residence necessitated the introduction of a warehouse (*kappiyabhūmi*),[5] a building outside the monastery to store articles of food, etc., and *upaṭṭhānasālā*,[6] a building inside the monastery for serving meals to the monks. Thus other things along with eatables were also stored up outside the monastery and in due course the office of *kappiyakāraka*[1] was created in order to make the things allowable to the monks.

---

[1] Cf. *MV*, 1. 9. 29, p. 21; *DN*. Vol. II, p. 78; etc.

[2] *Bhag*, 270, p. 293a.

[3] *MV*, 6. 5. 15, pp. 229-30.

[4] Ibid, 6. 20.36, p. 253.

[5] Ibid, 6.20.36, pp. 253-54.

[6] *CV*, 6. 1. 8, p. 246.

Finally, the monks too were allowed to keep certain things in their own possession, though not without some restriction. As such a monk was permitted to store up any type of medicaments in general, and ghee, butter, oil, honey and molasses in particular for a week. Any one going astray was liable to be dealt with according to the law.[2] Certain roots, namely, turmeric, ginger, etc. could be stored up even for the whole life, but could be used in cases of emergency only.[3]

On the contrary, storing up articles of food[4] or even over-night preservation of food[5] was not allowed to the Jaina monks. As such to eat food procured in the first quarter (*porisī*) of the day in the fourth *porisī* was regarded as a transgression for which the person concerned had to undergo expiatory punishment.[6] Later on however the Sthavirakalpika monks were allowed to preserve food acquired in the first *porisī* upto the fourth *porisī* of the day.[7]

Now it is clear that the Jainas, so far as the preservation of food was concerned, were poles apart from the Buddhists as they were not allowed even a day-long preservation of food, whereas the Buddhists could have a permanent stock of food. But it would not be improper to bring to notice that this practice of the Buddhists was contentious because the first of the ten points of strife which were responsible for the division of the Order was pertaining to storing up articles of food, i. e. carrying salt in horn.[8]

(b) Paṁsukūlacīvara

It goes without saying that the Buddha preferred religious life of modest habits. But he did never intend to make away with the most popular social usages as some of his senior as well as contemporary teachers were alleged to have done in the name of monastic

---

1. *MV*, 6. 6. 16, p. 230.
2. Ibid, 6. 3. 12, p. 228; *PM*, 5. 23.
3. Ibid, 6. 2. 4, p. 219.
4. *Uttar*, 16. 7-8.
5. *Dasv*, 3. 2-3; 10. 8.
6. *Nis*, 12. 30.
7. *BṛhkB*, Vol. V, 5264a-78.
8. Vide *siṅgiloṇakappa—CV*, 12. 2. 13, p. 422.

ideal. His intention, on the contrary, was to comply with the manners and customs in vogue as far as possible and practicable. So his best effort was not to violate the well-established rules of society. Our contention is laid bare by an instance recorded in the *Mahāvagga*.

Once, it so happened that a monk came naked to the Buddha and made an earnest request to him to prescribe nakedness to the Saṅgha. The argument put forward by him in support of his suggestion was that the Blessed One himself had spoken very high of modest habits. Nakedness, in his opinion was *ne plus ultra* in this respect. Though his argument was well-reasoned and convincing too, yet the Blessed One did not yield to it and enjoined upon the fraternity not to adopt nakedness like the *titthiyas*.[1]

With this sanction to use robes, the monks were advised to be satisfied with robes inasmuch as was sufficient to cherish their bodies.[2] Naturally they were advised to dress themselves in robes made of rags saken from dust-heaps.[3] This state of things continued for a pretty long period of twenty years when Jīvaka, the royal physician of the Magadhan king Bimbisāra, came forward for the first time to offer to the Buddha a suit of Siveyyaka cloth which he accepted without any attachment. This occasioned the Buddha to sanction lay-robe (*gahapati-cīvara*) to the monks.[4] Thus the use of robes made of cast-off rags was made optional.

It was merely a gap of thirteen months after his renunciation that Mahāvīra adopted nakedness.[5] Not only this, but he also enjoined upon his followers to do the same.[1] Despite the fact that this attitude of Mahāvīra has found experession at several places in terms like *nagiṇa*[2] and *acela*[3], etc., several references contradictory to nudity constrain us to stand by the side of Dr. Deo's remark "that the rules about clothing did not seem to make it (nudity) a compulsory item"[4]. Even the Jinakalpika monks, or in the words of Schubring the 'naked monks'[5] of the Śvetāmbara sect are referred to have used clothes. Such self-contradictory regulations, most probably, were among the causes which enabled the Jaina Church to split into two, the sky-clad (*Digambara*) and the white-clad (Śvetāmbara).

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, 8. 24. 45, pp. 319f.

[2] *DN*, Vol. I, pp. 63-63.

[3] *MV*, 1. 22. 73, p. 55.

[4] Ibid, 8. 8. 12, p. 297.

[5] The tradition says that the parents of Lord Mahāvīra were followers of Pārśva whose disciples, according to the *Uttarādhyayanasūtra*, used clothes and followed *cāturyāma dharma*. Lord Mahāvīra appears to have initiated himself following the rules of Pārśva's Church prevalent at the time. It is therefore no wonder that he used robe in the beginning. Later on under the influence of the Ājīvikas or similar sects he adopted nakedness which led him a little away from the followers of Pārśva, though the cleavage was not complete in view of the essential indentical ontological and ethical doctrines of the two Churches. Mahāvīra's reform in this respect was not completely successful and rapprochement was affected between the two Churches as is evidenced in the *Uttarādhyayanasūtra*, No. xxiii. In later times that reconciliation found expression in the form of two more or less antagonistic sects called Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras within the same Church.

Now it may however be remarked that the Jaina monks are allowed to use clothes, but as less as possible and the used ones at that as "to a mendicant who is little clothed (*acela*),[6] and firm in control (*parivusie*), it will never accur (to think): My clothes are torn (*parijuṇṇe*), I shall beg for (new) clothes, I shall beg for the thread (*suttaṁ*), I shall beg for a needle (*sūīṁ*), I shall repair them or stitch them, I shall put them on (*parihissāmi*), I shall wrap myself in them (*pāuṇissāmi*)"[7]. The same view is further expressed by the law which augment or reduce the number of clothes to be used according to the season.[8]

(i) *Material and colour of the robe*

According to the original rule, the Buddhist monks were to dress themselves in cast-off rags. Later on this strictness was dispensed with the sanction to use robes which were made of flax (*khomaṁ*), cotton (*kappāsikaṁ*), silk (*koseyyaṁ*), wool (*kambalaṁ*) and hemp (*sāṇaṁbhaṅgaṁ*).[9] No wonder that the earliest Jaina accounts in point however agree with the Buddhist as they also allowed the monks to use robes prepared from wool (*jaṅgiyaṁ*), silk (*bhaṅgiyaṁ*), hemp (*sāṇayaṁ*), plam-leaves (*poṭṭayaṁ*), cotton (*khomiyaṁ*) and *arhatula* or any other material of the type (*tahappagāraṁ*).[10] In addition to the

---

1. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 1. 8. 1. 3 (p. 79); *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), pp 259f.
2. *Dasv*, 6. 65.
3. *Ṭhāṇ*, 693, p. 460b.
4. *HJM*, p. 160.
5. *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 39, p. 267.
6. Later on *acelatva* is explained as using a little and old clothes only.—Comm. to *Ṭhāṇ*, pp. 467b-468a; *HJM*, p. 161, fn 114.
7. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 1. 6. 3. 1 (p. 57).
8. Ibid, 1. 7. 6. 1 (p. 71).
9. *MV*, 1. 22. 73, p. 55.
10. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 5. 1. 1 (p. 157); *Bṛhk*, 2. 29.

first four types of robes allowed by the *Ācārāṅgasūtra*, the *Sthānāṅgasūtra*[1] also sanctioned *tiriḍa* robes.

Normally only cotton and woolen robes were to be used, and the rest, only if these two were not available. It may however be noted that the use of *tiriḍa*-robes was not in vogue among the Buddhists. These two facts together show the late introduction of *tiriḍa* robes to the Jaina Order.

The use of robes made of grass (*kusa*), bark (*vāka*), *phalaka*, hair (*kesakambala*), skin of wild animal (*vālakambala*), the feathers of owl (*ulūkapakkha*), the skin of antelope (*ajinakkhipa*), the stalks of akka-plant (*akkanāla*) and *potthaka*-fibre was deemed unfit for the Sakkaputtiya monks as they were the symbols of the *titthiyas*.[2] Similarly the Jainas too were not allowed the use of robes which were prepared out of fine and beautiful fur (*ājiṇāṁ vā sahiṇāṁ vā hiṇakallāṇāṁ vā sahiṇakallāṇi*), of goat's hair (*āyāṇi*), of blue cotton (*dugullāṇi*), of *patta*, of malaya-fibre (*malayāṇi*), of bark-fibre (*pattuṇṇāṇi*), muslin (*aṁsuyāṇi*), of silk (*cīṇaṁsuyāṇi*); or those which were called Desarāga, Amila, Gajjala, Phaliya and Kāyaha; blankets (*kambala*), cloaks (*pāvarāṇi*), plaids (*āiṇapāuraṇāṇi*), or any other robe of such type.[3]

The only colour which the Sakkaputtiya monks preferred to use in dyeing their robes was saffron (*kasāya*). As such robes that were all of a blue (*sabbanīla*), yellow (*sabbapīta*), crimson (*sabbalohita*), brown (*sabbamañjiṭṭha*), black (*sabbakaṇha*), brownish-yellow (*sabbamahāraṅgaratta*) and dark-yellow (*sabbamahānāmaratta*) colours were deemed unfit for their use.[4]

The Jainas used simply white robes and hence they were called *sukkambarā samaṇā* (white-clad monks).[5] It was therefore natural for them that they were prohibited the use of robes which were bought (*kītaṁ*), washed (*dhoyaṁ*), dyed (*rattaṁ*), brushed, rubbed, cleaned, or perfumed (*sampadhūmitaṁ*).[6]

The rule that a Buddhist should not use jacket (*kañcuka*) or any other robe decorated with skirts, or with flowers or with sluff[7] had its detailed counterpart in the regulation which prohibited the use of plaids made of Udra, Pesa-fur, embroidered with Pesa-fur, made of the fur of black, blue, yellow or golden plaids glittering like gold, interwoven with gold, set with gold, embroidered with gold, plaids made of tiger's fur, highly ornamented plaids, plaids covered with ornaments to a Jaina monk[1].

---

[1] *Op, Cit.*, 446, pp. 338ab.

[2] *MV*, 8. 25. 46, pp. 320-321.

[3] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 5. 1. 1 (pp. 157-58).

[4] *MV*, 8. 26. 47, p. 321.

[5] *ĀvasN*, 357, p. 234b.

[6] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 1. 7. 4. 1 (p. 68).

[7] *MV*, 8. 26. 47, p. 321.

(ii) *Dyeing materials and the process of dyeing*

The Buddhist sources give not only a complete list of dyeing-stuff, but also a thorough procedure of dyeing robes which may be summed up as below.

In the beginning, cowdung (*chakāṇa*) and yellow clay (*paṇḍu-mattika*) were used as dye-stuff. Their use was immediately forbidden as they produced bad colour. Instead, six kinds of dye—dye made of roots (*mūlarajana*), trunks of trees (*khandharajana*), bark (*tacarajana*), leaves (*pattarajana*), flowers (*puppharajana*) and fruits (*phalarajana*) were made allowable to the Order.

Robes should be dyed with duly boiled dye. Usually vessels and bowls were used as dye-pots. It was forbidden to rub cloth against the dye-pots. In case the cloth was dyed deep it was made light-coloured by dipping it into water. If after dyeing, the cloth had become rough, it was smoothed by beating it with hands.[2]

A monk was however forbidden to get his soiled robes or goat's wool washed, dyed or beaten by a nun, not related to him.[3]

Once, it has been referred to before that the Jaina monks were called *sukkambarā samaṇā* as they dressed in white robes only. It was therefore in consonance with their practice that neither dyeing nor undyeing of clothes were allowed to them.[4] It was perhaps because of the reason that the early Jaina monks were not allowed to wash even their bodies much less their robes.

(iii) *Preparation of robes*

As the Buddhists deemed it unlawful to use uncut (*acchinnaka*) cloth, so they prepared their robes out of small pieces of cloth sewn together. Accordingly any sort of acceptable cloth offered to them, irrespective of their value and quality, was to be transformed by cutting and sewing together into pieces of cloth suitable to them.[5]

---

1. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 5. 1. 3-5 (pp. 157-58).
2. *MV*, 8. 13. 19, pp. 302-303.
3. *PM*, 4. 4, 17.
4. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.5. 2. 1 (p. 163); 2. 5. 2. 5 (p. 164); *Nis*, 18. 21-64.
5. *MV*, 8. 14. 20, pp. 303-304.

They were asked to prepare a double waist-cloth (*saṅghāṭi*), a single upper-garment (*uttarāsaṅga*) and a single under-garment (*antaravāsaka*) of cloths which were new (*ahata*) or as good as new (*ahatakappa*).[1] In case the cloths were old, then they were to prepare a fourfould waist-cloth, a double upper-garment and a double under-garment.[2]

In the beginning the Jainas saw no harm in dressing in uncut robes, because they were advised to use cloth as it was offered to them.[3] But not very late, they were also forbidden to use uncut and untorn cloths, and appropriate *prāyascittas* were prescribed for accepting complete pieces of cloth which were generally determined by the price of the cloth. The higher was the price, the heavier was the punishment. Making any type of alteration in the cloth by cutting, etc. was vindicated by some sort of punishments.[4]

Stiching of clothes was however allowed to the mendicants belonging to both the Orders.[5] In this connection it may be stated that the Buddhists were forbidden to get their robes stitched by a nun not related to them,[6] and the Jaina ascetics either by a heretic or by a householder (*gāratthiya*)[7].

(iv) *Number of robes to be used*

Lay-robe made allowable the Buddhist Order made the monks lavish in the use of dress. Hence, the number of robes to be used at a time was fixed. The monks were allowed, in all, a set of three robes—a double waist-cloth (*saṅghāṭi*), a single upper-garment (*uttarāsaṅga*) and a single under-garment (*antaravāsaka*), as their ordinary dress.[8]

The Jaina Order seems to have prescribed the same number of robes as the Buddhist, *viz.* three. Out of those three robes, two were of linen or of cotton, used as under-garment (*antarijjagaṁ*) and the third of wool which was used as an upper-garment (*uttarijjagaṁ*).[9] The followers of Pārśva, according to the *Uttarādhyayanasūtra*, used only two robes, an under-garment and an upper-garment.[1] It is peculiar to the Jaina Order that the number of robes to be used by a monk was sometimes determined by age,[2] while at other by season[3]. Thus the younger monks used only one robe while the older ones two or more.[4] In brief the monks were expected to use the least number of clothes as it was in consonance with their theory of *aparigraha*.

---

[1] *MV*, 8. 15. 21, pp. 304-5.
[2] Ibid, 8. 16. 23, p. 306.
[3] *Āyār* (*SBE.* Vol. XXII), 1. 7. 4. 1 (p. 68); 2. 5. 2. 1 (p. 163).
[4] *Nis*, 2. 23-24; *NisB*, 948-974; *Bṛhk*, 3. 7-10.
[5] *MV*, 8. 16. 23, p 306; *Nis*, 1. 31; 1. 49.
[6] *PM*, 5. 26.
[7] *Nis*, 5. 11.
[8] *MV*, 8. 15. 21, pp. 304-5.
[9] *Āyār* (*SBE.* Vol. XXII), 1. 7. 4. 1 (pp. 67-69); *Bṛhk*, 3. 15-16; *OghN*, 669. p. 208a; 675, p. 209a.

It may be noted that no laxity was granted to the nuns belonging to the Buddhist Order as "the ordinary dress of the Bhikkhunis or Sisters consisted of the same three garments as that of the Bhikkhus."[5] The Jaina Church, on the contrary, seems a bit less strict as it allowed four garments to the nuns.[6]

Besides the aforesaid set of three garments, the Buddhist Order also granted a rain-robe (*vassikasāṭaka*),[7] a cloth to wipe out the face (*mukhapuñchana-colaka*),[8] and itch-cloth (*kaṇḍupaṭicchādiṃ*)[9] and pieces of cloth-requisite (*parikkhāra-colaka*)[10] to the twofold Saṅgha in general and a bathing-robe (*udakasāṭika*)[11] to the Sisterhood in particular. Some of these clothes such as a set of three robes, the cloth to wipe out the face and pieces of cloth-requisite were to be exclusively possessed by an individual for ever whereas rain-robe and itch-cloth, etc. were to be assigned to others as soon as one's purpose had been accomplished.[12]

Likewise the Jaina Order of monks and nuns was also prescribed some small pieces of cloth, such as, *colapaṭṭa* (girdle), *muhapotti* (mouth-covering-cloth), *celacilimiliya* (a covering for the clothes or a curtain) and *paḍala* (a covering for the alms-bowl), etc. in order to meet their various requirements. The nuns, in addition to these could use eleven clothes more, six, namely, *uggahanantaga*, *paṭṭa*, *aḍḍhoruga*,[13]

---

1. *Op. cit.*, 23. 29.
2. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 1. 7. 4. 1 (pp. 67-8); *Bhag*, 333, p 374b.
3. The monks were to give up used-up robes and had to put on either one robe or no robe at all, after the winter was over.—Ibid, 1. 7. 6. 1 (p. 71).
4. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 1. 7. 4. 1 (67-68); 1. 7. 5. 1 (p. 69); 1. 7. 6. 2 (p. 71); *Bhag*, 333, p. 374b.
5. *Vinaya Texts* (*SBE*. Vol. XVII), p. 213 fn.
6. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 5. 1. 1 (p. 157); *Bṛhk*, 3. 16; *Ṭhān*, 246, p. 186b.
7. *MV*, 8. 17. 27, p. 310.
8. Ibid, 8. 18. 30, pp. 311-12.
9. Ibid, 8. 18. 29, p, 311.
10. Ibid, 8. 18. 32, p. 312.
11. Ibid, 8. 17. 27, p 310.
12. *MV*, 8. 19. 33, p. 312.
13. *Bhāṣya* to *OghN*, 315.

calaṇī[1], *antoniyaṁsaṇī*[2] and *bāhiraniyaṁsaṇī*[3], on the lower part of the body[4], and five, namely, *kañcuka*[5], *okacchiya*[6], *vegacchī*[7], *saṅghāḍi*[8] and *khandhakaraṇī*[9] on the upper portion of the body[10].

Against the strict discipline of the Jainas which allowed no lavishness or stock-piling of clothes,[11] the Buddhists are marked by the following relaxations as regards the use of robes.

It is true that it was not beseeming to the monks to receive and use extra robes in normal circumstances as the ordinary dress of a monk consisted of three robes only. But circumstances, however, forced the framers of the rules to grant some concession in this respect at least for a limited period of time, if not for ever. Thus a gift of special robe, offered ten days before the close of the later period of the retreat was to be received till the *kaṭhina*-robe had been settled.[12] Again, if after 'taking up the store of robes (*ubbhatasmiṁ kaṭhine*)', one's robe had been made or if one's robe had been spoiled or destroyed or burnt, or if one's hope to receive lay-robe had ended, then one could possess an extra set of robes for a period of ten days only.[13] These two exceptions to the general rule are enough to reveal that extra robes could be received ten days before and after the *pavāraṇā* ceremony. But it is remarkable that an extra set of robes could also be accepted out of season even, if anybody so wished and the period of possession in such case is longer than those in the previous cases, viz. one month.[14]

---

1. *Bhāṣya* to *OghN*, 315.
2. Ibid, 316.
3. Ibid.
4. *BṛhkB*, Vol. IV, 4084-87.
5. *Bhāṣya* to *OghN*, 317.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid, 318.
8. Ibid, 318-19; *BṛhkB*, Vol. IV, 4089-90.
9. *Bhāṣya* to *OghN*, 320.
10. *BṛhkB* Vol. IV, 4088-91.
11. je bhikkhu tihiṁ vatthehi parivusie......, tassa ṇaṁ no evaṁ bhavai--cautthaṁ vatthaṁ jāissāmi.—*Āyār*, 1. 7. 5. 1. je bhikkhu dohiṁ vatthehiṁ parivusie......, tassa ṇaṁ no evaṁ bhavai--taiyaṁ vatthaṁ jāissāmi.—Ibid, 1. 7. 5. 1. je bhikkhu egeṇavatthena parivusie......, tassa ṇaṁ no evaṁ bhavai--bīiyaṁ vatthaṁ jāissāmi.--Ibid, 1. 7. 6. 1.
12. *PM*, 4. 28.
13. Ibid, 4. 1.
14. Ibid, 4. 3.

To keep extra robes after 'taking up of the store of robes(*kaṭhinuddhāra*)' was regarded as an aberration of the monastic discipline.[1] If anybody possessed a spare robe, it was to be given either to a needy monk[2] or to one's parents[3]. Anybody acting against these rules ought to be dealt with according to the law.[4]

(*v*) *The size of the robes*

The size of the robes to be used by a Buddhist must be smaller than that of the Buddha which normally was four and half cubits in length and three cubits in breadth.[5] This was perhaps the size of the *uttarāsaṅga*. In this connection it is remarkable that the text, which even prescribes the size of *kaṇḍupaṭicchādi*[6] and *vassikasāṭika*[7] as two cubits by one cubit, and three cubits by one and half cubits respectively, fails to give any size of the *antaravāsaka* and the *saṅghāṭi*, two of the three main robes allowed to the mendicants. It was perhaps due to the reason that their size differed according to the size of the individuals.

Before making any reference to the size of the robes to be used by the Jaina ascetics, it will not be improper to remark that neither th Aṅgas nor the Mūlasūtras contain a complete information about the size of the robes. According to the *Ācārāṅgasūtra*, one of the four robes allowed to the nuns should be two cubits broad, the other two, three cubits broad and the fourth, four cubits broad.[8] This information of the *Ācārāṅgasūtra* which omits the length of the robes is again partially supplemented by the *Oghaniryukti*[9] which gives the length, perhaps of the first robe, as two and half cubits.

Thus neither the Buddhist nor the Jaina sources are complete in details as regards the size of the robes. In absence of complete information, it is however difficult to make any categorical remark. Anyway, it may be concluded that the standard size of the clothing was that which was required to cover that portion of the body on which it was worn.

---

1. *Vinaya Texts* (*SBE*. Vol. XIII), p. 19 fn.
2. *MV*, 8. 16. 22, p. 305.
3. Ibid, 8. 19. 36, p. 313.
4. Ibid, 8. 16. 22, p. 305.
5. *PM*, 5. 92.
6. Ibid, 5. 90.
7. Ibid, 5. 91.
8. *Op. cit.* 2. 5. 1. 1 (p. 157); *Ṭhān*, 246, p. 186b.
9. *Op. cit.* 705, p. 213b.

(*vi*) *The purpose behind the use of cloth*

It is however certain that both Buddhism and Jainism admitted that clothing was to be used not for bodily decoration but for the protection of the body. It was, therefore, simply to put up with the chilly winds, to ward off the tortures caused by mosquitoes and insects, and to hide shame that the monks of the Buddhist Order used clothing.[1] So also the Jaina asectics wore clothing with a view to avoid shame (*hiripattitaṁ*), public disrespect on account of nakedness (*duguñchapattitaṁ*) and to put up with the parisahas (*parīsahavattiyaṁ*).[2] These reasons for the use of clothes remained more or less unchanged in spite of their amplification in the later Jaina texts.[3] Thus the Jaina Order fully assented to the Buddhist, because the reasons for permitting the Jaina monks to wear clothes were *ipso facto* the same as those of the Buddhist.

(*vii*) *Laying aside the robe*

Normally the Buddhist monks were expected to dress themselves properly. Particularly, they were asked to enter the houses of householders and to sit there outfitted with all their robes.[4] As such they were debarred even from entering a village, if clad simply in *saṅghāṭi* and *antaravāsaka*.[5] In the same way the Jaina asectics were asked not only to enter or to leave the house of lay-devotees dressed in all their garments, but also to go to a out-of-door place for easing the calls of nature, or for study or simply for wandering from village to village in the same manner.[6]

But the Buddhist Church, in due course, relaxed the strictness considerably. Monks as well as nuns were allowed to avail many privileges concerning various aspects of life after the solemnisation of the *kaṭhina* ceremony and the discipline to be observed in respect of the use of clothes was one of them. The first privilege was the

---

1. idha, bhikkhave, bhikkhu paṭisaṅkhā yoniso cīvaraṁ paṭisevati–'yāvadeva sitassa paṭighātāya, unhassa paṭighātāya, daṁsa-makasavātātapasiriṁsa-vasamphassānaṁ paṭighātāya, yāvadeva hirikopinappaṭicchādanatthaṁ. *MN*, Vol. I, p. 14.
2. *Ṭhāṇ*, 171, p. 138a; *Dasv*, 6. 20.
3. *OghN*, 706, p. 213b gives six reasons for the use of cloth.
4. timaṇḍalaṁ prṭicchādentena parimaṇḍalaṁ nivāsetvā kāyabandhanaṁ bandhitvā sagunaṁ katvā saṅghāṭiyo pārupitvā ganthikaṁ paṭimuñcitvā ......gāmo pavisitabbo.—*CV*, 8. 5. 9, p. 317; 8. 6. 11, p. 320; *PM*, 7. 1-4.
5. na santaruttarena gāmo pavisitabbo.—*MV*, 8. 19. 37, p. 313.
6. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2, 5. 2. 1 (p. 163).

relaxation of the first *nissaggiya* rule, i. e. to allow a monk to use as many robes as he required (*yāvadattha cīvaraṁ),* and the second that of the second *nissaggiya* rule, i. e. to allow a monk to go to a village or town leaving any of the three robes (*asamādānacāro*). One more privilege pertaining to the use of cloth which the monks were allowed to avail was that the *āvāsika* monks were free to share the robes among themselves or with the *āgantuka* monks *(yo ca tattha cīvaruppāde so nesaṁ bhavissati).*[1]

Later on, a monk was allowed to go on begging-tour[2] even without dressing himself in the usual set of three robes[3]. Besides, on other occasions too, they were permitted to separate from either of the three robes. As such a forest-dweller (*āraññaka*), if he had observed the rain-retreat upto the full-moon day in the months of October and November (Kārtika), was allowed to deposit either of the three robes in a safe place for a period of six days only on the ground that forest-dwelling was insecure and dangerous.[4] Moreover, if any one was sick, or if it was time to enter upon the rain-retreat, or if a river was to be crossed, or if the monastery was well-furnished with a bolt, or if the *kaṭhina* ceremony had been performed, then one could separate *sine die* from any one of the usual three robes without incurring any aberration of the monastic discipline.[5]

(*viii*) *Seeking proper robes and materials for robes*

The licence to use lay-robe made the problem of seeking clothes easy to a great extent because lay-devotees were always at the beck and call of the monks of the Buddhist Order to provide them with all sorts of clothes. But it is to be noted that some restrictions were imposed upon the monks in connection with the preparation, acquisition and transfer, etc. of such clothes which may be summed up as below.

A monk was not allowed to :

a. supply yarn to weavers to get it woven into cloth;

b. give directions to the weavers, if a lay-devotee was getting the cloth woven in order to give him;

c. ask a lay-devotee, not related to him for robe, if his robe was not destroyed;

---

[1] *MV*, 7. 1. 1, p. 267.

[2] Ibid, 7. 1. 1, p. 266.

[3] *Vinaya Texts* (*SBE*. Vol. XVII), p. 151 fn 1.

[4] *PM*, 4. 29.

[5] *MV*, 8. 19. 37, pp. 313-314.

d. receive the material for robes beyond the limit;

e. receive or to give a robe to a nun, not related to him, except in exchange; and

f. get prepared a robe for a nun not related to him.

So far as the seeking of *paṁsukūla* was concerned cemeteries, dust-heaps and lanes of a town were deemed the best places where it could be sought with ease and confidence. The *Mahāvagga* contains some rules as regards the distribution of *paṁsukūlas* sought by the monks.[1]

So far as the begging of the clothes by the Jaina monks was concerned, they could go to a distance of half a *yojana* only.[2] Normally before they undertook a-begging for clothes from the householders, they sought the permission of the *ācārya* who himself was forbidden from going for begging clothes. Having approached a householder, they requested him for the specific type of clothing they were in need of.[3] Nobody was allowed to ask a person for a thing which he did not see[4] or to ask him again and again[5] or to threaten him for clothes[6].

Nobody was allowed to buy clothes, or to cause somebody to buy for one's behalf, or to accept bought clothes.[7] Besides, when accepting the offer of clothes, they must keep in mind that the clothes were pure and acceptable. Accordingly the clothes which had been prepared specially for the monks, or were needed by the donor himself,[8] or were expensive, or were made from the stuff not allowed to the monks, or were neither fit nor lasting,[9] were to be rejected by the monks[10].

Any sort of future promises from the householders regarding clothing was not to be entertained by the monks.[11] Anything offered to them was to be accepted after a thorough inspection only, because

---

1. *Op. cit.*, 8. 10. 16, pp. 299f.
2. *Āyār* (*SBE.* Vol. XXII), 2. 5. 1. 2 (p. 157).
3. Ibid, 2. 5. 1.2 (p. 157).
4. *Kapp* (*SBE.* Vol. XXII), p. 298.
5. *Nis*, 18. 21-64.
6. *Āyār* (*SBE.* Vol. XXII), 2. 1. 6. 3 (p. 103).
7. *Nis*, 18. 21-64.
8. *Āyār* (*SBE.* Vol. XXII), 2. 5. 1. 3 (p. 158); 2. 5. 1. 6-10 (pp. 158 60).
9. Ibid, 2. 5. 1. 11-15 (pp. 160-61).
10. Ibid, 2. 5. 1. 3-15 (pp. 157-61).
11. Ibid, 2. 5. 1. 10 (pp. 159-60); *Dasv*, *Cūliyā*, 2. 8.

it was feared to contain any worldly thing like ear-ring, etc. or living beings.[1]

Thus it is apparent that the Buddhists, like the Jainas, too were constrained to depend on the piety of the laity for robes, though their earliest rule, i.e. wearing in cast-off rags picked up from the dust-heaps, most probably, intended to make them independent in this regard. The last point of agreement was that none of them was allowed to purchase clothes.

Before closing the topic it may be referred to that the Buddhist Order, in contradistinction to the Jaina, refers to certain officers, such as, *cīvarapaṭiggahāpaka*,[2] *cīvaranidahaka*,[3] *bhaṇḍāgārika*[4] and *cīvarabhājaka*,[5] who were responsible for the collection of robes from the laity, their preservation and distribution to the monks. It is also worth mentioning that the Jainas who were allowed the least use of water, were however permitted to wash their clothes (and other requisites) a little before the rainy season set in.[6]

(c) Rukkhamūlasenāsana

Besides scattered references to the third *nissaya*, the *senāsana*, a separate section called the *Senāsanakkhandhaka* has been spared in the *Cullavagga* in order to exhaust the rules concerned. It is said that the monks, in their early days, lived in the woods, at the foot of trees and hills, in grottoes and caves, in cemeteries and forests, and in the open space and the heaps of straw. The permission to use a dwelling like a *vihāra* (a monastery), an *aḍḍhayoga* (a pinnacled house), a *pāsāda* (a storeyed building), a *hammiya* (an attic) and a *guhā* (a cave) for the first time is ascribed to the request of a *seṭṭhī* of Rājagṛha who is said to have dedicated sixty dwellings for the use of the Order of the four quarters (*cātuddisāsaṅgha*). This instance of the *seṭṭhī* invited the attention of the laity who out of devotion for the Buddha and his Order came forward in large numbers to construct magnificent buildings for the Order.[7]

It is not at all surprising, if the Order later on started getting old buildings repaired or new buildings constructed under the supervision of a qualified monk known as *navakammika* who was also allowed some privileges for his duty of supervision.[1] Not only this, even an individual monk could get a hut or an abode constructed for his own use (*attuddesaṁ*).[2]

---

[1] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 5. 1. 14 (p. 161).

[2] *MV*, 8. 11. 17, p. 300.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid, 8. 12. 18, p. 301.

[5] Ibid, 8. 12. 18, pp. 301-302.

[6] *OghN*, 349-57, pp. 131b-133a.

[7] *CV*, 6. 1. 3, pp. 239-41.

The ideal site for the construction of a building for the Saṅgha, according to the *Mahāvagga*, is a place "not too far from the town and not too near, suitable for going and coming, easily accessible for all people who want (to see him), by day not too crowded, at night not exposed to much noise and alarm, clean of the smell of people, hidden from men, well-fitted for a retired life".[3] The *Visuddhimagga*, one of the well-known non-canonical text of the Pāli literature advocates that an ideal monastery should be free from eighteen types of fault, namely, largeness, newness, dilapidatedness, a nearby road, a pond, (edible) leaves, flowers, fruits, famousness, a nearby city, nearby timber trees, nearby arable fields, presence of the incompatible persons, a nearby port of entry, nearness to the border countries, nearness to the frontier of a kingdom, unsuitability and lack of good friends.[4]

In brief the monastery should be situated in a place with open space around it, not exposed to dangers and disturbances.[5]

In the biginning, as the buildings were constructed without any previous plan, they were of different size and of diverse shape. But after sometime both the size and the shape were considerably settled for years to come. The standard size of a small hut was twelve spans in length and seven spans in breadth.[6] The size of a big residence is, however, not specifically mentioned.[7] As it has been stated before that there must be open space around the monastery, normally it was situated in a park (*ārāma*) most often enclosed with bamboos, thorns and ditches. The *vihāra* itself was fenced with a brick or stonewall, or with a wooden fencing. The material used in the construction of most of the *vihāras* were brick, stone and wood. The walls of a *vihāra*, in addition to their white-washing and colouring black or red, were decorated with drawings and paintings and creepers. But figures of men and women were in no case to be painted over the walls. Hooks and cupboards were also fitted in the walls. The main building was divided into serveral chambers so that each and every monk might be provided with a separate room in order to enable them to maintain privacy and cultivate concentration.[1]

---

[1] *CV*, 6. 11. 30, pp. 268 72.

[2] *PM*, 2. 6-7.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 1. 16. 59, p 38; *Vinaya Texts* (*SBE*. Vol. XIII), p. 143.

[4] Vide *The Path of Purification*, p. 122.

[5] *PM*, 2. 6-7.

[6] Ibid, 2. 6.

[7] Ibid, 2. 7.

Normally a courtyard (*pariveṇa*), a store-room (*koṭṭhaka*), a service-hall (*upaṭṭhānasālā*), a fire-place (*aggisālā*), a werehouse (*kappiya-kuṭi*), a privy (*vaccakuṭi*), a cloister (*caṅkama*), a well (*udapāna*), a bathroom (*jantāghara*), a pond (*pokkharaṇi*) and a portico (*maṇḍapa*) were arranged within the precincts of an *ārāma*.[2]

Besides, each and every *vihāra* was well-furnished with beds, seats, and other articles of furniture. The articles of furniture which comprised of beds or seats, bedstead with short removable legs, arm-chairs, sofas, cushioned chairs, carpets, matress, pillows, bolsters and spittoon, etc.[3] were, as a rule, not the property of an individual, but of the whole community.[4] An elaborate instruction was laid down for the careful use, sanitation and preservation of those articles known as *senāsanavattaṁ*.[5]

It is well-known that the Jaina monks wandered from place to place throughout the whole year but the rainy season. It was on account of this very fact that they found the least occasion for having a permanent dwelling place of their own. Practically they halted, in course of their tour, wherever the day melted into evening and the night set in. Thus what they were concerned with was the search for a suitable abode rather than the construction and such other aspects of a residence. Accordingly the Niryuktis,[6] instead of containing regulations as regards the construction, etc. of a house by the monks, contains elaborate details concerning the vigorous search carried on by the monks for a suitable abode, specially during the rainy season.

Once, it has been said that the monks, when searching out a suitable abode, were always conscious of two things, that is, the place

---

1. *CV*, 6. 1. 5-10, pp. 244-48.
2. *MV*, 1. 18. 66, pp. 45-46; 1. 19. 67, pp. 49-50; 1. 23. 78, pp. 59-60; 1. 24. 79, pp. 63-64; *CV*, 8. 8. 15, pp. 323-24; *EMB*, p. 286.
3. Ibid.
4. *MV*, 8. 24. 44, p. 319.
5. *CV*, 8. 8, pp. 323-25. Similar directions regarding the use of bathroom and privy are known as *jantāgharavattaṁ* and *vaccakuṭivattaṁ* respectively.—Vide Ibid, 8. 9, pp. 325-26; 8. 10, pp. 326-27.
6. *OghN*, 128-52, pp. 62-68; *DasāN*, 8. 8-27, pp. 53b-56b.

should have neither any scope for inflicting injury to living beings nor for indulging in misconduct. Therefore they tried to find out a place free from living beings, eggs and cobwebs;[1] having a suitable place for easing call of nature and a place where there was easy to procure food, drink[2] and medicine[3]. So far as the commission of misconduct was concerned, sometimes it so happened that the ladies of the house inhabitted by the monks enabled them to have sexual intercourse with a view to have a healthy child from them.[4] It was, therefore, befitting that the monks normally disliked a house used simultaneously by householders;[5] a place visited by women, beasts, eunuchs[6] and heretics[7] and preferred secluded places like gardens, temples, potters' workshops, caves, forests, roots of trees, deserted houses and burning grounds[8] to residences specially built for them, places which were likely to make the monks passionate, regions which had no king or regions where the king was wicked[9].

Having found out a suitable residence, the monks sought the formal permission of the lawful proprietor of the house before occupying it.[10] It was perhaps because of the reason that the owner of the house (*sejjātari*) provided them the necessary articles of furniture, if they were in such a need. The main articles of furniture comprised of stool, bench, bed, couch, etc., which they could use freely during the rainy season, and in case of sickness and old age in dry seasons.[11] After their purpose was over, they returned these articles to the persons from whom borrowed.[12]

This study of the rules concerning the residence of two important sects of Indian mendicants brings out that the Jainas alone could stick to houselessness in the true sense of the term. The greatest benefit which they drew from their wandering life was that they could maintain good relation with the lay-devotees and could also promote faith and devotion in them for the religion. It is one of the various reasons that Jainism could survive in the place of its birth. On the contrary, the introduction of corporate life at a fixed place and the sanction to hoard all sorts of property within the precincts of the *vihāra* made the Buddhist mendicants to disregard the interest of the householders which ultimately spoiled the cordial relation between the mendicants and the householders. It was perhaps one of the greatest blows which drove Buddhism out of India for good. The corporate life led by the Buddhist monks finally emerged in the shape of Buddhist universities like Takśaśilā and Nālandā in ancient India.

---

[1] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII) 2. 2. 1. 1-7 (pp. 120-22); 2. 2. 2. 1-4 (pp. 124-26).

[2] Vide *OghN*, 132, p. 63a; *DasāN*, 8. 8-27, pp. 53b-56b.

[3] *OghN*, 164, p. 71b; *HJM*, p. 247; *DasāN*, 8 8-27, pp. 53b-56b.

[4] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 2. 1. 8-12 (pp. 122-124).

[5] Ibid, 2. 2. 2. 6 (p. 126); 2. 2. 3. 5-11 (pp. 131-132).

[6] *Nāyā*, p. 76; *Bhag*, p. 758b.

[7] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 2. 2. 8-13 (pp. 126-28).

[8] *Vivāgasuyaṁ*, p. 17; *Uttar*, 9. 4; 18. 4; 23. 4-8; *Nāyā*, p. 69; *Antg*, p. 41.

[9] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 1. 7. 2. 1 (p. 64); *Uttar*, 2. 19-20; 32. 16; *Mūl*, 10. 58-60.

[10] Ibid, 2. 2. 3. 14 (pp. 128-29).

[11] *Vav*, 8. 2.

[12] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 2. 3. 23 (p. 134); *Bṛhk*, 3. 25-28; *Nis*, 2. 53-58; *Vav*, 8. 7-10.

(d) Pūtimuttabhesajja

As in the case of the requisites mentioned before, the fourth requisite, *pūtimuttabhesajja* too has been dealt with in a separate section known as the *Bhesajjakkhandhaka* in the *Mahāvagga*. As we have already seen, the use of stinking-urine *(pūtimutta)* was the original rule. It was however slackened with the permission of the use of ghee *(sappi)*, butter (*navanīta*), oil *(tela)*, honey (*madhu*) and molasses (*phāṇita*) as extra-allowances to the Order.[1]

Besides, the following things were prescribed to the Buddhist Order for its general use as medicine :

i. fat of certain animals such as bear (*accha*), fish (*maccha*), alligator (*susuka*), swine (*sūkara*) and ass (*gadrabha*);[2]

ii. certain roots such as turmeric (*haliddi*), ginger (*siṅgivera*), orris root (*vaca*), white orris root (*vacattha*), *ativisa*, black hellebore (*kaṭukarohiṇi*), *usīra* root, *bhaddamuttaka* root, etc.;

iii. certain astringent things—the *nimba*, the *kuṭaja*, the *pakkava*, the *nattamāla*, etc.;

iv. fruits, flowers, leaves and barks of certain trees and plants such as *nimba*, *kuṭaja*, *paṭola*, *tulasī* and *kappāsa*, etc.;

v. certain fruits, namely, the *vilaṅga*, the *pippala*, the marice peppers, the *harītaka*, the *vibhitaka*, the *āmalaka*, myrobalan and the goth, etc.;

vi. certain gums, namely, the *hiṅgu*, the *hiṅgulaka*, the *sipatika*, *taka*, *takapatti*, *takapaṇṇi*, *sajjulasa*, etc.;

---

[1] *MV*, 6. 1. 1-2, pp. 218-19.

[2] Ibid, 6. 1. 3, p. 219.

vii. certain salts, namely, sea-salt (*sāmudda*), black-salt (*kāḷaloṇa*), rock-salt (*sindhava*), kitchen-salt (*ubbhida*), red-salt (*bila*), etc.;[1]

viii. sugar and sugar-water (for healthy person)[2].

Besides the aforesaid prescriptions, this section gives not only a list of several diseases, but also their infallible remedies and cures. To supply a list of the same may be of some use here.

	Diseases	Remedies and cures
i.	Skin diseases-itch (*kaṇḍu*), boils (*pilaka*), a discharge (*assāva*), scabs (*thullakacchu*) and ill-smelling of body (*kāyadūggandha*)	Medicine made from calcium (*chuṇama*)[3]
ii.	A disease not human (*amanussikābādha*)	Raw flesh (*āmakamaṁsa*) and raw blood (*āmakalohita*)[4]
iii.	Diseases of the eyes (*cakkhuroga*)	Black collyrium (*kālañjana*), *rasa* ointment (*rasañjana*), *sota* ointment (*sotañjana*), *geruka* ointment (*geruka*) and soot ointment (*kapalla*)[5]
iv.	Head-ache or any other disease of the head (*sīsābhitāpa*)	Taking medicine through the nose (*natthukamma*) and smoking (*dhumapāna*)[6]
v.	a. Wind disease (*vātābādha*) b. Wind in the stomach (*udaravātābādha*)	a. Decoction of oil (*telapāka*) mixed with strong drink (*majja*)[7] b. Salt-sour-gruel (*loṇasovīra*)[8]

---

[1] *MV*, 6. 2. 4, pp. 219-220.

[2] Ibid, 6. 4. 13-14, p 228.

[3] Ibid, 6. 2. 5, pp. 220f. The use of cowdung (*chakaṇa*), clay (*mattikā*) and colouring substance (*rajananippaka*) is prescribed even to healthy persons.

[4] Ibid, 6. 2. 5, pp. 220f.

[5] Ibid, 6. 2. 6, pp. 221f. Elaborate directions as regards the ointment-box and its other accessories have been given.

[6] Ibid 6. 2. 7, pp 222f. The treatment of *sīsābādha*, very likely the same disease as *sīsābhitāpa*, by giving medicine through nose (*natthukamma*) is thus given in the *Mahāvagga*: Jīvakakomārabhacca, after examining the change in *seṭṭhi's* wife, took a handful (*pasata*) of ghee and boiled it up with other drugs. Then making her laid down on her back, he gave it her through her nose. Thus one dose was sufficient to restore her to health.—Ibid, 8, 2. 5, pp. 223f.

[7] Ibid, 6. 2. 8, pp. 223f.

[8] Ibid, 6. 4. 14, p. 228.

vi	Rheumatism (*aṅgavāta*)	To bring on sweating by different methods (*sedakamma*)[1]
vii.	Intermittent ague (*pabbavāta*)	Letting out of blood (*lohitamocana*)[2]
viii.	Feet blister (*pādaphālana*)	Ointment for the feet (*pādabbhañjana*)[3]
ix.	Boils (*gaṇḍābādha*)	Surgical operation (*satthakamma*)[4]
x.	Snake-bite (*ahidaṭṭhaṇa*)	Four kinds of filth—dung (*gūtha*), urine (*mutta*), ashes (*chārika*) & clay (*mattikā*)[5]
xi.	Poison-drinking (*visapāna*)	Dung (*gūtha*)[6]
xii.	*Gharadinnakābādha*	A decoction of soil turned up by the plough (*sītāloli*)[7]
xiii.	Constipation (*duṭṭhagahaṇika*)	A decoction of ashes of burnt rice (*āmisakhāra*)[8]
xiv.	Jaundice (*paṇḍurogābādha*)	A decoction made with cows' urine (*muttaharītaka*)[9]
xv.	Skin-disease (*chavidosābādha*)	Ointing with perfumes (*gandhalepa*)[10]
xvi.	Superfluity of humours (*abhisannakāya*)	Use of numerous purgatives (*virecana*)[11]
xvii.	Fistula (*bhagandalābādha*)	Ointing (*ālepana*)[12]

Moreover, there are diseases like leprosy (*kuṭṭha*), dry-leprosy (*kilāsa*), consumption (*sosa*) and fits (*apamāra*) which are only referred to in the text, but their remedies are not mentioned as in the cases already stated.[1]

---

[1] *MV*, 6. 2. 8, pp. 223f.

[2] Ibid, 6. 2. 8, pp. 223f.

[3] Ibid, 6. 2. 8, p. 224.

[4] Ibid, 6. 2. 8, p. 224.

[5] Ibid, 6. 2. 9, pp. 224f.

[6] Ibid, 6. 2. 9, pp. 224f.

[7] bid, 6. 2. 10; p. 225.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid. At another place *abhisannakāya* is followed by *bahvābādha* and the remedies prescribed is the use of *caṅkama* (cloister) and *jantāghara* (bath-room), i. e. walking and hot-water bath --*CV*, 5. 8. 18, p. 208; also *Vinaya Texts* (*SBE*. Vol. XX), p. 103 fn 1-2.

[12] Ibid, 8. 3. 6, pp. 290f.

We have seen that surgical operation without any restriction was permissible to the Order. But later on due to an ugly instance of Ākāsagotta, a physician, the use of lancet and clyster within a distance of two inches round the private parts of the body was disallowed.[2]

Other details regarding medicaments, though not elaborate, were yet sufficient to put a monk on the right path so far as their acquisition, storing, use, etc. were concerned. Some of these rules have already been stated in connection with the appraisal of the rules pertaining to food as it was thought appropriate there.[3]

Before we conclude, it would not be out of place to state that Jīvakakomārabhacca, the renowned physician of the time, had been requested by Bimbisāra, the king of Magadha to wait upon the Order.[4] Another physician who is referred to have waited upon the Order was Ākāsagotta who has already been mentioned. These two instances together and people's remark on Jīvaka's refusal to treat them of their diseases[5] are sufficient to assert that the Order practically used all kinds of medicines and medical appliances, known at the time.

On the other hand, the Jaina sources are not unanimous as regards the use of medicinal as well as surgical treatment by the Jaina monks. The *Ācārāṅgasūtra*[6] informs that Mahāvīra himself did not use medicine when he was ill, while the *Bhagavatīsūtra*[7] informs that he took *majjārakaḍa* and *kukkuḍamaṁsa* (according to the commentator these were the preparations from some vegetables) as cure against bilious fever (*pittajara*). Whatever might have been the reason for this apparent contradiction, other evidences like the practice of taking some medicine or undergoing some medicinal treatment only with the permission of the teacher,[8] taking into consideration the medical facilities when searching out a lodge for the rain retreat,[9] etc. are enough

---

1. *MV*, 1. 31. 88, p. 76.
2. Ibid, 6. 5. 20, p. 233.
3. Vide *Supra*, pp. 114-18.
4. *MV*, 8. 3. 6, pp. 290f.
5. Ibid, 1. 31. 89, pp. 76f.
6. *Āyār (SBE*. Vol. XXII), 1. 8. 4. 1 (p. 86).
7. *Op. Cit.* 557, pp. 1259a-1263a.
8. *Kapp (SBE*. Vol. XXII), pp. 306-307.
9. *DasāN*, 8. 21, p. 56a.

to remark that the monks took all types of medical aid whenever needed.

The Jaina texts abound in references to various diseases and the possible ways of their treatment. A list of sixteen diseases, namely, boils (*gaṇḍi*), leprosy (*kuṭṭha* of eighteen kinds), consumption (*rāyaṁsī*), epilepsy (*avamāriya*), blindness (*kāṇiya*), stiffness (*jhimiya*), lameness (*kūṇiya*), humpback (*khujiya*), dropsy, (*udari*), dumbness (*mūya*), swelling (*sūṇiya*), over-appetite (*gilāsaṇi*), trembling (*vevai*), disablement (*pīḍhasappi*), elephantiasis (*silīvaya*) and diabetes (*madhumeha*) is found in the *Ācārāṅgasūtra*[1] and the other comprising asthma (*sāsa*), cough (*kāsa*), fever (*jara*),[2] inflamation (*dāha*), intestinal colic (*kucchisūla*), fistula (*bhagaṁdara*), piles (*arisā*),[3] indigestion (*ajīraa*),[4] optic neuralgia (*diṭṭhisūla*), cerebral neuralgia (*muddhasūla*), loss of appetite (*akāraya*), pain in the eye (*acchiveyaṇā*), pain in the ear (*kaṇṇaveyaṇā*), itches (*kaṇḍu*), dropsy (*uyara*), and leprosy (*koḍha*) in the *Vipākasūtra*[5].

In addition to the list of diseases just referred to, the *Vipākasūtra* mentions the various ways of the treatment of diseases, such as, by applying oil (*abhaṅga*) or powder (*uvvaṭṭaṇa*), oil drinks (*siṇehapāṇa*), vomitting (*vamaṇa*), purging (*vireyaṇa*), branding (*avaddahaṇa*), medicated baths (*avaṇhāṇa*), oil enema (*aṇuvāsaṇa*), curing the diseases of the head with skin (*batthikamma*)[6], purging by drugs (*nirūha*), opening veins (*sirāveha*), cutting (*tacchaṇa*), scraping (*pacchaṇa*), bathing the head with oils (*sirobatthi*), nourishing the body with oils (*tappaṇa*), by means of ingredients roasted on fire by *puṭapāka* method, barks, roots, bulbs, leaves, flowers, fruits, seeds, bitters (*silika*), pills, drugs (*osaha*) and mixtures (*bhesajja*).[7] Besides this general list of the different methods of treatment of the diseases, the scattered references to various diseases and their unfailing cures come thus in the Jaina texts :

---

1. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 1. 6. 13 (pp. 53f); 2. 2. 1. 8 (p. 122); 2. 4. 2. 1 (pp. 152-3).
2. *Bhag*, 386, p. 484b; 557, p 1260b refer to *pittajara* (bilious fever).
3. Another term for *arisa* is *aṁsiyāo* –*Bhag*, 572, pp. 1293a-1293b.
4. Ibid, 557, p. 1260b. It refers to *lohiyavacca* (blood dysentery).
5. *Op. cit.*, p. 10.
6. It may also mean the application of pergatives through anus. Vide *Pāiyasaddamahaṇṇavo, Sub Voce.*
7. *Op. cit.*, p. 11; Vide *The Life in Ancient India*, p. 179.

	Diseases	Remedies and cures
i.	Bilious fever (*pittajara*)	Meat and wine[1]
ii.	Bilious fever and blood dysentery	Meat or some preparation from vegetables[2]
iii.	Piles	Operation[3]
iv.	Fistula	Flesh and rice-powder (*kaṇikka*) mixed with honey and *ghee*[4]
v.	Different kinds of leprosy—	
	a. *Pāmā*	Droppings of ram's and cow's urine[5]
	b. *Kimikuṭṭha* (leprosy full of maggots)	*Gosisa* sandal[6]
	c. *Galantakoḍha* (bad leprosy), piles, *kacchu* and *kiḍibha* (a kind of leprosy)	Hairless skin[7]
vi.	a. Snake-bite, cholera and fever	a. Drinking urine[8]
	b. Snake-bite	b. Ant-hill-mud, salt, gold and incantations[9]
vii.	Blisters caused by snake-bite and spider	Sprinkling of water[10]
viii.	Dog-bite	To make lie down on tiger-skin (*divicamma*)[11]
ix.	Eye-sore (*acchiniya*)	Pills (*guliya*)[12]
x.	Flatulence (*uddhavāta*), paralysis (*dhanuggāha*), piles, acute pain, dislocation of hand or foot, etc.	To make lie down on skin[13]

---

1. *Nāyā*, p. 80.
2. *Bhag*, 557, pp. 1259a-1263a; Comm. to *Bhag*, p. 1270.
3. Ibid, 572, p. 1293a-93b.
4. *Cūrṇi* to *Nis*, p 89.
5. *OghN*, 134a.
6. *Cūrṇi* to *Āvas*, p. 133.
7. *BṛhkB*, Vol. IV, 3839-3840.
8. *Bṛhk*, 5, 37.
9. *Cūrṇi* to *Nis. Pīṭhikā*, pp. 58, 121.
10. *OghN*, 335-336, p. 129a.
11. *BṛhkB*, Vol. IV, 3817.
12. Ibid, 1277.
13. Ibid, 3816-18; 3839-41; *Bṛhk*, 3. 3-6.

xi. Rheumatism (*vāta*)	To wrap the affected part with the skin of a hyena (*taraccha*)[1].

Most likely all these methods of treatment were permissible to the monks. This remark is evidenced by the references to the taking of meat and wine by monks as cure for bilious fever,[2] some preparation from vegetables to cure blood dysentery,[3] the great *vikṛtis* in case of illness[4] and the like. Besides, the *Bhagavatīsūtra* bears evidence of the treatment of a monk suffering from piles by surgical operation.[5]

In spite of the fact that the monks were allowed to take help of all types of treatment of a disease, they were not allowed the study and the practice of medical sciences. They were, therefore, neither allowed to rub oil, *ghee*, fat (*vasa*), butter, *loddha* (root of certain tree), cake (*kakka*), powder (*uvaṭṭana*), etc. either on the body or on the wound (*vaṇa*) themselves;[6] nor to cure diseases like ulcer (*gaṇḍa*), boils (*pilaga*), piles (*asiya*) and fistula (*bhagandala*) either by operation or by applying medicine;[7] nor to take out worms (*pālukimiya* and *kucchikimiya*) by fingers[8].

Now it is clear that the monks belonging to both the Orders actually applied all kinds of treatment,[9] known at the time, which may conveniently be classified in two groups, *viz*. medicinal and surgical, to cure diseases according to their nature and classification. Not only most of the popular diseases like boils, piles rheumatism, fistula, itch, sanke-bite, skin-diseases, etc. are commonly referred to in both the sources, but the method of treatment in several cases is also the same. For instance, the cases of piles, snake-bite and certain skin-diseases may be named. One more peculiar feature which obtains with both the Churches is that they prescribe meat as a cure for certain disease. In absence of a thorough study on the lines of medical sciences, it is indeed very difficult to make any categorical remark as regards the exact nature and treatment of other diseases referred to in both the sources.

---

1. *Bṛhk B*, 3817-18.
2. *Nāyā*, p. 80.
3. *Bhag*, 557, p. 1261a.
4. *Ṭhān*, 172, p. 138a; Vide *Supra*, p. 15.
5. *Op.cit*, 572, pp. 1293a-1293b.
6. *Nis*, 3. 24-31.
7. Ibid, 3. 34-39.
8. Ibid, 3. 40.
9. *OghN*, 69-84, pp. 40b-47b gives a detailed procedure for waiting upon the sick and his treatment.

(e) Ownership, Succession, Distribution and Exchange of the Requisites

In its early days, when the Order had not been granted to avail extra-allowances, it actually owned no property. Monks were satisfied with food inasmuch as it was sufficient to keep their stomachs going, with robes inasmuch as it was sufficient to cherish their bodies, and so on. But certain reasons, as for example, the licence to avail extra-allowances, the multiplication of the members of the Saṅgha, and the introduction of corporate life in a settled *āvāsa* necessitated the acquisition of properties by the Saṅgha. As soon as the acquisition of properties became permissible, the question regarding their ownership, succession distribution and exchange, etc. came to the fore which was settled by framing appropriate rules from time to time.

Such contention regarding the ownership, succession, distribution and exchange of the requisites was not so prominent to the Jaina Church as it was to the Buddhist. The only reason which seems to be justified for such a remark was that the Jaina Church, truly speaking, owned no property as its very motto was to avoid all sorts of possession (*aparigraha*) Besides, the mobile life and no fixed residence constrained the Church to possess only such articles which could be carried from one place to another (*paḍihāriya*) conveniently. Thus we have alredy seen that the monks were allowed to have light and portable articles only. So that they could easily take those articles with them even at the time of begging alms.[1] So far as the case of the heavy articles like cot, bench, stool, etc. were concerned, the Church, whenever it was in such a need, borrowed them from the devoted householders and returned them back as soon as their purpose was served.[2] This appears to be one of the possible explanation to the fact that the promulgator or rather the promulgators of the monastic discipline, while they seem to have unduly emphasised and unnecessarily amplified the reglations pertaining to other aspects of requisites, did find no occasion to exhaust the regulations *sub judice*. Nevertheless, some references in point are made in the various texts which may be cited along with the Buddhist in order to compare and contrast their appropriateness, validity and mutual influence over one another.

Each and every article belonging to any member of the Buddhist Order virtually belonged to the Order itself. In other words, nobody could claim the property of the Saṅgha as one's own except the right

---

1. *Bṛhk*, 3. 25-28; *Nis*, 2. 53-58; *Vav*, 8. 2-10.
2. *Nis*, 2. 53-58.

of using it properly and equally with others. So also, it was unlawful to divert any gain of the Order how much trifle it might have been, if it had already been given to the Saṅgha.[1] As such a gift of robes made to one party of a divided assembly actually belonged to the whole assembly, if given with reference to the whole assembly (*saṅghassa demā ti*), except that the donor intended to give to one party only. Robes given to the Saṅgha before its division too were to be distributed equally among all the members of the Sangha.[2]

However, we come across in the *Ācārāṅgasūtra* a regulation to the same effect which goes even to the extent of advising a monk to be impartial in the distribution of the requisites like food, robes, etc., and neither to take undue share nor to select the nice things for himself.[3] Nevertheless, the Buddhists seem to have surpassed the Jainas. The rule, that any offer to be made to an individual member of the Saṅgha was to be offered to the Saṅgha with special reference to that person,[4] raised the Church to the status of supreme authority.

Even a senior member (*thera*) of the Buddhist Order had got no right over a gift of robes offered to the monks by a donor, even if it was the outcome of his imposing personality. It exclusively belonged to the monks to whom it had been offered, until the *kaṭhina* was performed.[5] The Jaina Church, on the other hand, followed a different sequence of the distribution of robes. According to this procedure, the clothes were distributed according to the status of the monk.[6] At another place, in the same record, the sequence adopted in the distribution of clothes is given as below. The *gurū* was allotted the best and the durable clothes for his use and the rest were distributed to the novice, ill, needy (*parimitopadhi*), well-read, preacher of text, old monks (*jātithera*), monks practising penance, monks not knowing the local dialect, monks endowed with special qualities, and then to the remaining monks in order of their seniority respectively. Sometimes, this sequence too was replaced by another one. According to this, it was to be given to the *ācārya* first, then to the ill, then to the needy, then to the respected ones, then to the *pravartinī*, then to the *sthavira*, then to the *gaṇāvacchedin*, then to the well-read, and then in the sequence

---

1. *PM*, 4. 30.
2. *MV*, 8. 28. 51, p. 323.
3. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 1. 5. 5 (pp. 101-102).
4 *MV*, 6. 7. 18, pp 231f.
5. Ibid. 8. 20. 38, pp. 314-315.
6. *Bṛhk*, 3. 19-20.

adverted to above.[1] It is however evident that the ill and the needy members of the Church were always given special attention in the distribution of clothing.

The monks belonging to both the Churches always intended to have the lion's share and the best possible clothing out of the whole lot. The Buddhists discouraged this tendency by asking a monk not to accept a share in the *kaṭhina*-robes in residence other than that in which he had kept his retreat. Though a monk was allowed to keep retreat in more than one residence, he was not to claim an equal share in the *kaṭhina*-robes in all the residences lived in. His share, on the contrary, was to be determined by the period of time lived in each residence.[2] The Jainas stopped this attitude by prescribing various *prāyascittas* in this respect.[3]

The rule that a robe given to another monk should not be taken back[4] also obtains with the Jainas. The *Ācārāṅgasūtra* does not allow a monk either to take back a robe given to another monk for himself or for somebody else, or to give clothing to others in exchange for another one.[5]

In normal circumstances, perhaps the exchange of robes was allowed to the Buddhist Order. But a monk was not allowed either to give to[6] or to receive[7] a robe from a nun not related to him.

Normally no exchange of requisites, such as, clothing[8], begging-bowl,[9] etc. was allowed to the Jaina monks without the sanction of the *gaṇi*. But they were allowed to give such things to helpless and needy members of the Church.[10] Exchange of robes between a monk and a nun was, however, permissible in cases of calamities and troubles.[11]

Not only the resident-monks of the Buddhist Church were obliged to give accommodation to and serve the in-coming monks in all possible ways befitting their rank,[1] but were also asked to give an equal share to the in-coming monks in the robes offered to the Saṅgha[2]. Similarly the Jaina ascetics were also obliged to provide accommodation to the in-coming monks[3] and to share food with them[4].

---

[1] *BṛhkB*, Vol. IV, 4314-29.
[2] *MV*, 8. 21 39. pp. 315-16.
[3] *BṛhkB*, Vol. IV, 4314-29.
[4] *PM*, 4. 25.
[5] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2. 5. 2. 2 (pp. 163-64).
[6] *PM*, 5. 25.
[7] Ibid, 4. 5.
[8] *Nis*, 18. 21-64.
[9] Ibid, 14. 1-4; 14. 5-7; 16. 25-29.
[10] Ibid, 14. 7; 18. 21-64.
[11] *BṛhkB*, Vol. IV, 3919-51; 3992-94.

Besides, the Buddhist jurisprudence is distinguished by the following rules as regards the requisites :

The most difficult task for the mendicants was to get their due share in the *kaṭhina*-robes which had, including the two *palibodhas* (obstacles), as many as hundred and fourteen causes of suspension of the *kaṭhina* privileges.[5]

Furthermore, if a monk after having kept his retreat leaves the place of his retreat (*pakkamati*); or admits that he is mad (*ummataka*), or that his mind is unhinged (*khittacitta*), or that he is afflicted with bodily pain (*vedanaṭṭa*), or that he has been suspended for his refusal to admit an offence (*āpattiyā adassane ukkhittaka*) or to atone for an offence (*āpattiyā appaṭikamme ukhhittaka*) or to renounce a false doctrine (*pāpikāya diṭṭhiyā appaṭinissagge ukkhittaka*); before a gift of robes has come to the Saṅgha, or if come, it has been divided among his fellow-monks; then the share due to him is to be assigned to another monk present there and fit to receive it on his behalf (*paṭirūpe gāhake*); whereas the Saṅgha is said to be the legal owner of the share due to a monk who having left the place of his retreat also leaves the Order (*vibbhamati*), or dies, or admits that he is a *sāmaṇera*, or guilty of an extreme offence (*antimavatthuṁ ajjhāpannaka*), or an eunuch (*paṇḍaka*), or an animal (*tiracchānagata*), or a matricide (*mātughātaka*), or a patricide (*pitughātaka*), or a arahantacide (*arahantaghātaka*), or a violator of nuns (*bhikkhunīdūsaka*), or a schismatic (*saṅghabhedaka*), or a hermaphrodite (*ubhatovyañjanaka*); or admits that he has given up the precepts (*sikkhāpaccakkhātaka*), or that he has furtively attached to the Saṅgha (*theyyasaṁvāsaka*), or that he has gone over to the heretics (*titthiyapakkantaka*), or that he has shed a Buddha's blood.[6]

If the number of monks keeping retreat in a monastery was less than the requisite number to constitute a Saṅgha, then they had the sole right over the robes given to the Saṅgha till the *kaṭhina* was not performed. But the robes offered to in seasons other than the rains was to be distributed to the members of the Order present there. The robes were to be appropriated by the monks offered to, if there was no Saṅgha. The in-coming monks too were entitled to get an equal share, if they arrived before the robes had been appropriated. But to give an equal share or not to give at all depended solely on the discretion of the monks appropriating the robes, if the in-coming monks came after the robes had been appropriated.[1]

---

[1] *CV*, 8. 2. 3-4, pp. 314-15.

[2] *MV*, 8. 20. 38, pp. 314-15.

[3] *Nis*, 17. 121-22.

[4] *OghN*. 212-15, pp. 88ab; 519-29, pp. 177a-179a.

[5] Vide the *Kaṭhinakkhandhaka* of the *Mahāvagga*.

[6] *MV*, 8. 27. 48-50, pp. 321-22.

The monks who have assisted a group of monks in getting *paṁsukūlas* either by waiting aside or by going with them to the cemetery must be given his due share, even if there had not been such agreement about the distribution of the robes. But monks who neither waited nor went to the cemetery in time ought not to get any share in the *paṁsukūlas* thus procured.[2]

Robes sent by a monk with the words 'give this robe to such and such a monk' (*imaṁ cīvaraṁ itthanāmassa dehī ti*) is said to have rightly been appropriated by the messenger-monk, if it has been appropriated in the name of the sender. To be very clear, if it is appropriated in good faith in the sender, or taking it as the robe of a deceased monk having come to know that the sendee is dead, or in good faith in the sender having come to know that the sendee is dead, or taking it as the robe of a deceased monk, that is, in the name of the sender having come to know that both are dead. But if it is sent with the words 'I give the robe to such and such a monk' (*imaṁ cīvaraṁ itthanāmassa dammī ti*), then it ought to be appropriated in the sendee's name. A monk, as a rule, has got no right over a robe, if it has already been given by him to any other member of the Order.[3]

A gift of robes, offered to by a lay-devotee to both the Saṅghas (of the monks and of the nuns), was to be distributed equally to all the members, monks as well as nuns. An equal share was to be given to both the Orders, the Bhikkhusaṅgha and the Bhikkhunīsaṅgha, even though the number of monks and nuns constituting either of the Orders was as less as one.[4] After the demise of a monk or a nun, the Bhikkhusaṅgha or the Bhikkhunīsaṅgha, as the case might be, was

---

1. *MV*, 8. 20. 38, pp. 314-15.
2. Ibid, 8. 10. 16, pp. 299f.
3. Ibid, 8. 29. 52-53, pp. 323-24.
4. Ibid, 8. 30. 54, pp. 324-25.

the legal heir to all his or her belongings. It was not to be transferred in any case from the Bhikkhusaṅgha to the Bhikkhunīsaṅgha or *vice versa.*[1] But the persons who attended him or her (i. e. the deceased monk or nun or *sāmaṇera* or *sāmaṇerī*) during his or her last sickness were not neglected. In such cases, robes and bowl were to fall in their share and the trifles were to be distributed to the members of the Saṅgha present there, and the heavy articles belonged to the Saṅgha of the four quarters.[2]

After the conversion of a heretic into the Buddhist Order, his properties vested in the Saṅgha. The case of Uruvela Kassapa may be taken as an instance in point.[3]

---

[1] *CV*, 10. 7. 18, p. 388.
[2] *MV*, 8. 23. 42-43, pp. 318-19.
[3] *CV*, 5. 18. 52, p. 233.

CHAPTER III

MONASTIC CEREMONIES

Section I

Uposatha

Section II

Vassāvāsa

Section III

Pavāraṇā

SECTION I

UPOSATHA

There is nothing incredible in the fact that there were some customs which were commonly prevailing in Indian religious life, and *uposatha* was one of such customs. Here follows a study of the same in the light of the three main faiths of India, the Brahmaṇism, Buddhism and Jainism.

(a) Brahmaṇical

The earliest reference to '*upavasatha*', the Sanskrit original of the Pāli '*uposatha*' and Prakrit '*posaha*', is made in the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*[1] which prescribes the sacrificial rites called Darśa and Puraṇamāsa on the occasion. The term *upavasatha* stands for a fast-day, specially the day preceding a Soma sacrifice, and also for the period of preparation for the Soma sacrifice.[2] The *Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra,*[3] too, appears to subscribe to the same view when it asserts that the *upavasatha* implies to live close to (the deities) which is possible only by performing certain sacrifices accompanied by *upavāsa* (fast) twice a month, i. e., on the last days of the dark-half (*amāvasyā*) and the bright-half (*paurṇamāsa*) of a month. The fasting is to be observed by the sacrificer on the instruction of the priests, and as such it is the duty of the householder. Hiraṇyakesin,[4] while dwelling upon the significance of the *upavasatha*, opines that the *upavasatha* means 'to avoid the company of impious and to seek the company of virtuous.'

This much we read about the ceremony of *upavasatha* in the Brahmaṇical sources. The Jaina as well as the Buddhist sources, on the other hand, contain elaborate rules as regards the different facets of the ceremony which will follow in the coming pages.

(b) Buddhist

According to an early tradition, the institution of the *uposatha* is ascribed to the request made by Bimbisāra, the king of Magadha, to the

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, II. 1. 4; I. 1.

[2] M. M. Williams, *Sanskrit English Dictionary, Sub voce 'upavasatha'.*

[3] *Op. cit.*, IV. 15. 35; Cf *Darśana Aur Cintana*, Vol. II, p. 106.

[4] upavrittastu pāpebhyo yastu vāso gunaiḥ saha upavāsaḥ sa vijñeyaḥ—as quoted in *EBJ*, p. 134.

Buddha. The king himself, according to the same tradition, owed this idea to the *titthiyas* (heretics). On the suggestion of the king, the Buddha enjoined upon the monks to assemble and hold *uposatha*. Novice as the monks were, they kept mum when they assembled, and thus invited scandalous remarks from the people.[1] Consequently, in order to appease the people they were advised to recite the Dhamma[2] which in due course was replaced by the recitation of the *Pātimokkha* and was known as *uposatha*-service (*uposathakamma*)[3].

The obvious reason of the introduction of the ceremony was to acquire lay-devotees by promoting faith in them through religious preaching on certain dates of every month as the heretics were doing from before. But not very late, this privilege was denied to the laities as it was converted into out and out a monastic observance. The reason for this abrupt change in its nature from social to monastic seems to be that the monks did not like to expose their omissions and commissions before the laities.

Originally the eighth, the fourteenth and the fifteenth days of a fortnight were regarded as *uposatha* days. But in due course the eighth day was dropped from the list and only the last two were retained. Not only this, the *Pātimokkha* was to be recited only once a fortnight, i. e., on either of the two remaining dates.[4] But finally, as it appears from the expression, '*ajjuposatho paṇṇaraso*', it became a fashion with the Order to recite the *Pātimokkha* only on the fifteenth[5] day of a fortnight.

As a rule, *uposatha* was to be held at a place fixed by the Saṅgha. Five kinds of buildings—a *vihāra*, an *aḍḍhayoga* (pinnacled house), a *pāsāda* (storeyed building), a *hammiya* (attic) and a *guhā* (cave) were ordinarily selected for the purpose. Holding *uposatha* in one's own cell or fixing two *uposatha*-halls (*uposathāgāra*) in one *āvāsa* (residence) was in no case allowed.[6] If there happened to be several *āvāsas* within the same boundary (*sīmā*), then *uposatha* was to be held at a place unanimously selected or in the *uposathāgāra* of the *āvāsa* inhabited by

---

1. *MV*, 2. 1 1, pp. 105-6.
2. Ibid, 2. 1.1, p. 106
3. Ibid, 2. 2. 2, p. 106.
4. Ibid, 2. 2. 5, p. 108.
5. Vide *PM*, *Nidāna*.
6. *MV*, 2. 5. 10, pp. 109-10.

the senior monks. Under unavoidable circumstances it could be solemnised even at the personal cell of a monk.[1]

In this connection, the terms *sīmā* and *āvāsa*, just referred to deserve some amplification. *Sīmā* was the circuit or the extent of the jurisdiction of an *āvāsa* or a number of *āvāsas*. The Christian equivalent of it is a diocese or parish. The *uposatha* could only be performed, if all the monks living within the *sīmā* of an *āvāsa* were either present or would have sent their consent (*chanda*) in absentia.[2]

Sīmā was decided by the usual *kammavācā* process by fixing some landmarks on the boundary of the jurisdiction. A mountain, a rock, a wood, a tree, a path, an anthill (*vammika*), a river and a tank (*udaka*), etc., were some of the conspicuous marks generally used for the purpose.[3] In case the *sīmā* of an *āvāsa* had not been settled, then the boundary of the adjacent village was supposed as its *sīmā*; and if the residence was situated in a forest without any nearby village, then the *sīmā* was extended up to seven *abbhantaras*[4] all around.[5] In case of a river, sea or the like, the *sīmā* ran as far as an average man could throw water[6] or even to the opposite side of a river, if there was any regular communication[7]. Normally a boundary either of more than three *yojanas* in expanse,[8] or overlapping or encompassing another one[9] was not to be fixed.

The *uposathāgāra* was furnished with the necessary articles, before the monks assembled there to hold *uposatha*. The senior members as a rule, were obliged to assemble first,[10] while the juniors were assigned with the duties of sweeping the hall; providing seats for the assembly; putting a lighted lamp, for most often the *uposatha* was held till very late in the night; and furnishing with drinking water and food for the

---

1. Cf. sace kho mayaṁ gilānaṁ ṭhānā cāvessāma āvādho vā abhivaḍḍhissati kālaṁ kiriyā vā bhavissati' ti na, bhikkhave, gilāno bhikkhu ṭhānā cāvetabbo, saṅghena tattha gantvā kammaṁ kātabbaṁ.—*MV*, 2. 20. 33, pp. 121-22; 2. 21. 34, p. 123.
2. *MV*, 2. 21. 34, pp. 122-23.
3. Ibid, 2. 4. 7, p. 109.
4. *Abbhantara* is a linear measure, equal to 28 hands.—*Book of Discipline*, Part II, Introduction, pp. 51-52.
5. *MV*, 2. 9. 16, p 113.
6. Ibid, 2. 9 16, p. 113.
7. Ibid, 2. 4. 9, p. 109.
8. Ibid, 2. 4. 9, p. 109.
9. Ibid, 2. 9. 17, p. 113.
10. Ibid, 2. 6. 11, p. 111.

incoming monks[1]. Monks and nuns were ordained to keep the first nine *sikkhāpadas* more enthusiastically on the *uposatha* day.[2]

When all had assembled, a duly qualified monk proclaimed the following *ñatti*—'Venerable monks should proclaim the *pārisuddhi* (purity), I will recite the *Pātimokkha*'. Those guilty of any offence confessed it in course of the recitation of the section concerned, and those who were free remained silent which indicated their purity.[3] The confession of faults (*uposatha*) by one deserving recommencement of the penal discipline (*mūlāyapaṭikassanāraho*)[4] or the sentence of *mānatta* discipline[5] was done according to seniority (*yathāvuḍḍhaṁ*). Preaching the Dhamma of one's own accord,[6] putting questions about the Vinaya[7] or answering[8] them without one's appointment by the assembly and rebuking anybody for his offence without the permission of the person concerned[9] were unlawful.

The recitation of the *Pātimokkha* in a complete and pure chapter of monks[10] was one of the special features of the *uposatha*. In normal circumstances, it was recited in its full extent. But in case of trouble (*antarāya*) either from a king or a thief or the like, it could be recited abridged.[11] So also, it was recited normally by a senior monk (*therādhikaṁ pātimokkhaṁ*). In case all the *theras* of an assembly were incapable to do so, then even a junior member could be entrusted with the job.[12] Moreover, it should not be recited in an assembly where there was a nun (bhikkhunī), a nun under training (*sikkhamānā*), a novice (*sāmaṇera*), a female novice (*sāmaṇerī*), a renegade (*sikkhāpaccakkhātaka*), a person guilty of an extreme offence (*antima-vatthuṁ ajjhāpannaka*), a eunuch (*paṇḍaka*) or the like or in an assembly otherwise impure.[13] Of the four types of

---

[1] samajjani padīpo ca udakaṁ āsanena ca /
uposathassa etāni pubbakaraṇaṁ ti vuccati //—*Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*, p. 11; *MV*, 2. 18. 28-31, pp. 119-20.

[2] *Aṅguttaranikāya*, Part IV, 9. 2. 8. 1, p. 33; At *Aṅguttaranikāya*, Part III, 8. 5. 1, the seventh and eighth *sikkhāpadās* are considered as one.

[3] *MV*, 2. 2. 3, p. 106.

[4] *CV*, 2. 2. 10, p. 72.

[5] Ibid, 2. 3. 14, p. 75.

[6] *MV*, 2. 11. 19, p. 115.

[7] Ibid, 2. 12. 20, p. 115.

[8] Ibid, 2. 13. 21, pp. 115-16.

[9] Ibid, 2. 14. 22, p. 116.

[10] *Aṅguttaranikāya*, Part III, 8. 2. 10, pp. 312-314.

[11] *MV*, 2. 11. 19, p. 114.

[12] Ibid, 2. 16, 24, pp. 117-18.

[13] Ibid, 2. 38. 52, pp. 141-42.

uposathakamma, namely, a service held unlawfully by an incomplete chapter, held unlawfully by a complete chapter, held lawfully by an incomplete chapter and held lawfully by a complete chapter, only the fourth type was deemed legal.[1]

In the beginning, the *Pātimokkha* was recited by the monks on behalf of the nuns in the *uposatha* meetings convened by the nuns. In due course, on account of the scandalous remarks of the people they were taught to recite it themselves.[2] But the nuns, even then, could not get rid of the subjugation of monks as they had to ask two or three days[3] beforehand on what day the *uposatha* would be[4].

If during or after the recitation of the *Pātimokkha* by an incomplete assembly being conscious or unconscious of its incompetency to hold *uposatha*, there arrived monks belonging to the same residence whose number was greater than those holding the *uposatha*, then the *Pātimokkha* must be recited again. If on the other hand their number was either equal to or less than those holding the *uposatha*, then it was not to be recited anew.[5]

Anybody guilty of an offence was not allowed to perform *uposatha*. A person doubtful of his offence was, however, permitted to attend it provided that he was ready to atone for his offence as soon as his doubt was removed. Neither a common confession of an offence nor a common acceptance of such confession was regarded lawful. On the *uposatha* day, if all the resident monks were guilty of a common offence, then one of them had to confess his guilt before a monk of a nearby *āvāsa* and the rest before him after his return. If even this much was not possible, then they had to atone for it even after the solemnisation of the ceremony.[6]

It was essential for all to attend the *uposatha* personally, if not so, then at least by proxy. Absence from the ceremony was allowed under circumstances beyond control only. No laxity in this respect was permissible on the plea of personal purity, how much great it might be. The virtuous members, on the contrary, were considered more responsible than ordinary monks or nuns. Buddha's admonition to

---

[1] *MV*, 2. 10. 18, pp. 115-10.

[2] *CV*, 10. 5. 6, pp. 379-80.

[3] According to the *Aṅguttaranikāya*, it should be asked a fortnight before the day of *uposatha*. *Op. cit.*, Vol. III, 8. 6. 1. 13, p. 371.

[4] *CV*, 10. 2. 2. 3, p. 375: *PM* (*Bhikkhunī*), 4. 59.

[5] *MV*, 2. 28. 41, pp. 129-31; 2. 29. 42, p. 132; 2. 30. 43, pp. 132-33; 2. 31. 44, pp. 133-34; 2. 32. 45, pp. 134-37.

[6] Ibid, 2. 27. 40, pp. 127-29.

Mahākappin, an *arahanta*, when he was hesitating to attend the ceremony may be cited as an instance in point :

"If you Brahmaṇas do not honour, do not regard, do not revere, do not pay reverence to the *uposatha*, who will then honour, regard, revere, pay reverence to the *uposatha* ? Go to the *uposatha* O Brahmaṇas, do not neglect to go, go to the functions of the Order, do not neglect to go."[1]

So also on the *uposatha* day, the monks were debarred from leaving a residence or non-residence inhabited by monks for a residence or non-residence without monks; or a residence or non-residence inhabited by monks belonging to different districts (*sīmā*), except with a Saṅgha (i e., with a number of monks sufficient for holding *uposatha*) or in case of danger.[2] But they were allowed to leave, even on *uposatha* day, a residence or non-residence inhabited by monks for a residence or non-residence inhabited by monks belonging to the same district provided that they could reach the place in due time.[3]

Out of the three types of *uposatha* referred to in the *Mahāvagga*, the *uposatha* just discussed is the *saṅgha-uposatha*, the other two being the *pārisuddhi* and the *adhiṭṭhāna*. The *uposatha* held by four or more than four monks or nuns is called *saṅgha-uposatha* as the minimum quorum for performing an ecclesiastical act is four. The recitation of the *Pātimokkha* is one of the essential features of *saṅgha-uposatha*. The declaration of *pārisuddhi* in order of seniority with the usual formality, if there be less than four monks in an *āvāsa* on the *uposatha* day, is called *pārisuddhi-uposatha* and the concentration of one's mind on the thought—'Today is my *uposatha* day', if there be only one monk in an *āvāsa* on that day, is designated *adhiṭṭhāna-uposatha*.[4] The concluding passage of the *Uposathakkhandhaka*[5] refers to a special type of *uposatha* held on any other day than the *uposatha* days for the sake of reconciliation of the Order which was known as *saṅgha-sāmaggī-uposatha*.

Besides these the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* gives three types of *uposatha* known as *gopālaka*, *nigṇṭha* and *ariya*.[6] The first two types make a

---

1. *MV*, 2. 3. 6, p. 108.
2. Ibid, 2. 36. 50, pp. 140-41.
3. Ibid, 2. 37. 51, p. 141.
4. Ibid, 2. 24. 37, pp. 125-26.
5. na ca, bhikkhave, anuposathe uposatho kātabbo, aññatra saṅghasāmaggiyā ti --Ibid, 2. 38. 52, p. 142.
6. *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, 3. 7. 10, pp. 190-91.

reference to the *uposatha* performed by the Jaina laity in which they, on the *uposatha* day, indulge in merriments,[1] and copy temporarily[2] the life of an ascetic by renouncing family ties and household duties respectively. The third type is the *uposatha* observed by the Buddhists themselves.

(c) Jaina

In Jainism the expression '*posaha*' or '*posadha*' stands for *uposatha*. The Jaina Sanskrit rendering of the term is *pauṣadha*[3] or sometimes *prauṣadha*.[4] Umāsvāti gives the word *parva* as the synonym of *pauṣadha* and includes *aṣṭamī*, *caturdasī* and *pañcadasī* or any other day (*tithi*) of the month as suitable for *pauṣadha*. The commentator Siddhasenagaṇin explains this statement of Umāsvāti as implying that on *aṣṭamī*, *caturdasī* and *pañcadasī*, the *pauṣadha* is to be necessarily observed, while any other day is to be selected according to the convenience of the person concerned.[5]

The *pauṣadha* in Jainism is meant exclusively for the laity. In the Jaina Scripture, we find references to *posahasālā*, that is, a place or hall set apart for performance of the *pauṣadha*. A Jaina *upāsaka* was required to fast on the day and live in the *posahasālā* like a monk abstaining from bath, powder, garlands and ornaments. He was also required to desist from all kinds of sinful activities and sit and sleep on *kuśa*-grass-mats or wooden planks procured for the purpose. He was also expected to practise various meditational postures and remain awake as far as possible meditating on religious principles and the nature of self. Generally the *pauṣadha* was observed for one day. But one could be allowed to continue it for more than one day also.[6] Besides the *vratī* (the person keeping the *posaha*) had to be very careful in the evacuation of bodily excreta (*utsarga*), acceptance of stool and bed, etc. (*ādāna*), returning such articles of use (*nikṣepa*), spreading bed, etc. on the ground (*saṁstāra*) and being not neglectful to any other rules of *pauṣadha* (*anādāra*).[7]

In the *Bhagavatīsūtra*[8] we find reference to a kind of *pauṣadha* (*pakkhiya-posaha*) when people went out and prepared food and drink

---

1. Cf. *Bhag*, 12. 1, p. 553a.
2. Cf. Ibid, 12. 1, p. 555a
3. *Tattva*, auto.comm. 7. 16.
4. *Pāiyasaddamahaṇṇavo*, *Sub voce*.
5. *Ṭīkā* to *Tattva*, p. 92.
6. *Uvāsagadasāo*, 1. 79, p. 18.
7. *Tattva*, 7. 29.
8. *Op. cit.*, 12. 1, p. 553a.

and passed the day in merriments. But this type of *pauṣadha* was not considered religious. It was called *pauṣadha* perhaps because it was associated with the *parva* days, such as *aṣṭamī* or *caturdasī*. It appears that the ceremonies, secular or religious, which were performed on *pauṣadha* or *parva* days were indiscriminately called *pauṣadhas.* And this explains the *Aṅguttara* reference to *gopālaka-uposatha.*[1]

In Jainism two kinds of *tapaḥ* (austerity) is recognised, namely internal and external, each of which is of six kinds.[2] Among the six kinds of internal austerities, the first is called *prāyaścitta* which has ten varieties, the second of which is called *pratikramaṇa*[3] meaning recoil from the sins committed. The second internal austerity is called *vinaya*[4] which has five varieties, the fifth being called *tapovinaya.* This *tapovinaya*[5] includes six obligatory acts (*āvaśyaka*), namely, *sāmāyika* (the practice of the equanimous mood of mind), *caturviṁsatistava* (hymns in praise of the twenty-four Tīrthaṅkaras), *vandana* (showing respects to the superiors), *pratikramaṇa* (condemnation of the transgressions committed by the monk), *pratyākhyāna* (determination to give up all sinful and unmonkly activities) and *kāyotsarga* (suspension of physical movements accompanied by mindfulness) Our main concern here is the nature and the content of *pratikramaṇa.* In the *pratikramaṇa,* the monk condemns himself for the sins and transgressions of the monastic rules committed by him. He makes confession of the transgressions before his preceptor. In other words, in the *pratikramaṇa* the monk is required to remember all the vows and rules of monastic life undertaken by him for life-long observance. He exerts himself to examine the shortcomings of his monastic life and make atonement for them.

To be exact the whole process beginning from *sāmāyika* and ending in *kāyotsarga* is the Jaina equivalent of the *uposatha* of the Buddhists. In the *Pātimokkha*, the punishments for the crimes committed are also mentioned. But in the Jaina *Pratikramaṇa,* the specific punisments are not mentioned, though, of course, the monks are required to recoil from their sinful deeds, condemn themselves privately *(nindā)* and publicly *(garhā)* and ultimately beg pardon of their respective preceptors by means of confession of their crimes *(ālocanā)*.[6] Unlike

---

1. Vide *Supra*, p 164.
2. *Anag*, 7. 4.
3. Ibid, 7. 33ff.
4. Ibid, 7. 60ff.
5. Ibid, 7. 75.
6. Ibid, 8. 62.

the Buddhist *uposatha*, the *pratikramaṇa* is done daily—in the morning for the transgressions done at night, and in the evening for the same committed during the day. There is also the provision of *pratikramaṇa* after a journey or similar act involving inadvertent commission of crime. Besides these, there are prescribed the fortnightly, four-monthly and yearly *pratikramaṇas*, in addition to the *uttamārtha-pratikramaṇa* done for the attainment of the supreme goal of life, namely, *mokṣa*.[1]

It is thus found that there are essential points of agreement between the Buddhist *uposatha* and the Jaina *pratikramaṇa*, rather the complete obligatory monastic act beginning from *sāmāyika* and ending in *kāyotsarga*.

In this connection the problem why in Jainism the *pauṣadha* was exclusively meant for the householders, while in Buddhism it was exclusively prescribed for the monks deserves consideration. The Jaina monks performed *pratikramaṇa* on the last day of every fortnight in which they recited all possible omissions and commissions, and transgressions and expressed their purity. The *pratikramaṇa* was obviously performed on the *parva* days. The contents of the Buddhist *Pātimokkha* is very similar to the contents of the Jaina *pratikramaṇa* and it appears that the Buddhists introduced the *Pātimokkha* for a purpose similar to that of the Jainas. The *Pātimokkha* was recited on the *uposatha* day and was in due course identified with the latter, though the identification was never complete inasmuch as we find *uposathas* performed on other days for other purposes as mentioned above. As regards Jainism there was no occasion for identifying *pratikramaṇa* with *pauṣadha* which was left exclusively for the laymen.

It has already been stated that *upavasatha* stood for a fast-day and the fasting was observed on the *pūrṇimā* and *amāvāsyā*. It appears that *pūrṇimā* and *amāvāsyā* were in due course recognised as *upavasatha* or fasting days, and thus there was a kind of necessary association between *upavāsa* and the *pūrṇimā* and the *amāyāsyā* days. Consequently *pūrṇimā* and *amāyāsyā* came to be designated as *upavasatha* days. Various religious sects accepted the *uposatha* day as specially suited date for religious observances, fasting being one of their essential features. This is perhaps the reason why we find the word *upavāsa* necessarily associated with *pauṣadha*. The Buddhists were not in favour of such fasting and so we find the Buddhist *uposatha* never associated with *upavāsa*.

---

[1] ālocaṇaṁ divasiyaṁ rāiyaṁ iriyāvahaṁ ca boddhavvaṁ /
pakkhaya cādummāsiya saṁvaccharamuttamaṭṭhaṁ ca //
—Comm. to *Anag*, 8.57.

(d) Conclusion

It is almost certain that the *uposatha* owes, in some form or other a pre-Śramaṇic origin. Pt. Shri Sukhlalji Sanghavi also holds the same opinion which is manifest in his following words :

"There is no material before us for determining how one tradition influenced another a thousand years ago. Nevertheless we may venture to observe that the *upavasatha* (fasting) in the Vedic tradition was considered to be the means of acquisition of a pleasant condition (heaven ?). In the Śramaṇic tradition on the other hand *uposatha*[1] or *posaha* was regarded as the instrument of the good (salvation). Viewed from the course of evolution it is found that the conception of the good (blessed condition) has come about among mankind after that of the pleasant. If this be true, the custom of *upavāsa* (fast) or *posaha* in the Śramaṇic tradition, however ancient it may be, must be held to bear the impress of the fasting ceremony of the Vedic cult of sacrifice".[2]

One point more which may be gathered from this study is that the Buddhist were the last to adopt this practice, firstly, because they admit frankly enough that the ceremony was already in vogue among the *titthiyas*, and secondly, the Jaina *posaha*, like the Vedic *upavasatha*, was a sole concern of the householders rather than of the mendicants as we find in case of the Buddhist. This adherence of the Jainas to the original form takes the Jaina *posaha* to greater antiquity than the *uposatha* of the Buddhists who wrought a change in the original form (i. e. from social to monastic), in all probability, 'to claim a greater antiquity and novelty.

---

[1] The *uposatha* ceremony in the Buddhist tradition did not include fasting, though it might be the original content of it.

[2] *Darśana Aur Cintana*, Vol. II, p. 107.

SECTION II

VASSĀVĀSA

(i) *Universality of the custom among Indian Mendicant Orders*

Nobody can deny that life, household or ascetic, is influenced and moulded by the climatic conditions of a country. Indian ascetic life was not an exception to this law. Wandering ascetics were constrained by the inclemencies of weather to adhere to one place at least during the rains Accordingly, the Brahmaṇical religious codes (*Dharmaśāstras*) enjoined upon the mendicants to remain at one place (i. e. *dhruvaśīla*) during the rainy season.[1] It was prescribed for the Buddhists to keep retreat (*vassāvāsa*)[2] and the Jainas too were ordained to observe *cāturmāsa* during the four months of the rains[3].

Thus it is apparent that retreat during the rains was a necessity for the ascetics irrespective of their sects or schools rather than a custom imbued with religious sentiments

It is difficult to say whether the Brahmaṇical ascetics lived alone or in group, because the extant Brahmaṇical religious codes are not complete in every detail in this respect. The period of retreat is however stated to be of four months' duration.[4] Other sources like the Buddhist and the Jaina too do not furnish us with exact and adequate information in point. The *Ācārāṅgasūtra* however informs us that the heretics (*samaṇā*) sometimes prolonged their stay at the same place even after the four months of the rainy reason and also five or ten days of winter had elapsed.[5] So also, the Pāli Vinaya mentions that the heretics (*aññatitthiya*) were also in the habit of sticking to one place in the rainy season.[6] This is what we are informed in brief about the institution of the retreat of the Brahmaṇical fold.

In serveral cases what is simply referred to in the Brahmaṇical sources, is exhaustively dealt with in the Jaina and the Buddhist

---

1. *Gautama* (*SBE*. Vol. II), 3.13; *Baudhāyana* (*SBE*, Vol. XIV), 2.6.11.20.
2. *MV*, 3.1.1, p. 144.
3. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.3.1.1 (p. 136); *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol XXII), p. 296.
4. Vide *Āruṇeyopaniṣada*, 4.
5. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.3.1.4 (p. 137).
6. *MV*, 3.1.1, p. 144.

sources Accordingly, the Jaina as well as the Buddhist sources comprise minute details concerning every walk of ascetic life during the rainy season which is the subject matter of the the section proposed.

(ii) *The causes of the Institution of the Retreat*

As a matter of fact, no direct mention is made in the Pāli Vinaya of the reasons which were responsible for the introduction of retreat in the Buddhist Saṅgha. However, according to the same sourses, the apparent reasons which led to the institution of the retreat were public comment that the monks were indulging in the destruction of vegetable and small living beings by going out on tours during the rainy season—'*vassaṁ pi cārikaṁ caranti, haritāni tiṇāni sammaddantā, ekindriyaṁ jīvaṁ viheṭhentā bahu khuddake pāṇe saṅghātaṁ āpādentā*'[1], and as such monks' intention to avoid injury even to vegetation. It is beyond any doubt that the monks were relieved from the inconveniences of going out on tours during the rains when there were profuse mud and water along the roads, though their intention behind the introduction of the retreat had never been so is apparent from the Pāli Vinaya.

The reasons which were responsible for the introduction of the retreat in the Jaina Order were non-injury and inconveniences of travels during the rains. Naturally the *Ācārāṅgasūtra* ordained the monks to remain at one place during the rainy season, because the roads were full of living beings of various species.[2] Besides, the monks could also prolong their stay at the same place even after the end of the rainy season, in case the roads still were full of living creatures, or of mud and water, etc.[3], or in case the rains had not stopped as yet or in case of calamity, famine (*omoyariya*), royal disfavour or illness[4].

Now what we may infer is that the principal cause of the institution of the retreat in both the Orders, the Buddhist as well as the Jaina, was the same, that is non-injury. Though avoidance of inconveniences of travels is indirectly recorded as the secondary cause by the Jaina sources whereas the Buddhist records are silent in this respect, yet our speculation that it would have been the primary cause responsible for the introduction of the retreat in Indian mendicant life may not be altogether untrue and incorrect. Whatever might have been the case, it is certain that by doing so, they also evaded the inconveniences of travels during the rains when the roads were slushy. Thus the climate appears to be solely responsible for the introduction of the custom in Indian ascetic life.

---

[1] *MV*, 3.1.1, p. 144.

[2] *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2 3 1.1 (p. 136).

[3] Ibid, 2.3.1. 4–5 (p. 137).

[4] *DasāN*, 8. 22–23, p. 56a.

(*iii*) *Periods of Retreat and their duration*

Lord Buddha allowed two periods of the retreat each of three months' duration.[1] One of them commenced from the day after the full-moon of *Asāḷha* (June-July) and the other a month after it and were known as the earlier (*purimikā*) and the later (*pacchimikā*) retreat respectively.[2]

It is a point worth noticing that the Pāli Vinaya does not refer to the circumstances which forced the monks to practise an alternative period of retreat. However it mentions that the entrance upon the retreat was sometimes postponed for the next full-moon, if the king so so desired,[3] most probably because of an attack from the enemy king or disturbances on the border, etc. As such it may be remarked that one of the various reasons which constrained the Saṅgha to sanction an alternative period of retreat was the king's command in adverse circumstances.

Mahāvīra is recorded to have observed the practice of rain-retreat when 'a month and twenty nights of the actual rainy season (as calculated to start from the *Āsāḷhi-pūrṇimā*) had elapsed'.[4] So did his immediate disciples (*gaṇadharas*) and other followers. According to the same account the fixed stay at one place may also be started earlier than the aforesaid period, but on no account later than that.[5] As regards the exact dates of commencement and cessation, the *Samavāyāṅgasūtra* informs us that it commenced after the expiry of one month and twenty days of the actual rainy season, that is after the expiry of the month of *Śrāvaṇa* (July-August) and twenty days of *Bhādrapada* (August-September), and terminated after seventy days therefrom, that is on the full-moon day of *Kārtika* (October-November).[6]

---

1. *MV*, 3 1.1, p. 144; *CV*, 6.6.25, p. 263.
2. Ibid, 3.1.1, p. 144.
3. Ibid, 3 2.3, p. 145.
4. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol XXII), p. 296.
5. Ibid, p. 297. *Cūrṇi to DasāN* (8.12, p. 54) ordains to start the retreat latest by the fifth of the first fortnight of *Śrāvaṇa*.
6. *Op. cit*., 70, p. 81a. Dr. Deo has misunderstood the phrase '*savīsārīemāse vaikante*', and also seems to have overlooked its commentary as he has interpreted it 'the month of *Jyeṣṭha* and twenty days of *Asāḷha* had elapsed'. —*HJM*, p. 158.

In course of time the practice was made more strict and stringent as the monks were asked to stay at one place not only during the full-fledged retreat (*vāsāvāsa*), but also in the first showers (*paḍhama-pāusammi*) starting from the *Āsāḷhī-pūrṇimā*.[1] This practice is also corroborated by the *Daśāśrutaskandhaniryukti* which recorded the actual dates of commencement and termination in this case as the full-moon day of *Asāḷha* and the tenth day of the *Mārgaśirṣa* (November-December) respectively.[2] This is enough to remark that the duration of the retreat was extended to four months and ten days in the maximum. This is to be noted that the monks were careful enough in disclosing this long duration of their stay to the owner of the house as it involved their prestige and personality.[3]

As has already been said, sometimes the *cāturmāsa* continued for more than four months, that is for five months in the maximum. Thus the *vassā* kept by a monk at his former place of stay because of not getting any other suitable place up to the full-moon day of *Asāḷha*,[4] or his prolonged stay at the same place even after the full-moon of *Kārtika* due to excessive mud on the road or non-stoppage of rain, etc., was considered to be of more than four moths' duration.[5]

Opposed to this, we also come across instances of *cāturmāsa* lasting less than four months. If anybody, on account of scarcity of suitable lodge, commenced the retreat on the fifth of the bright-half of the *Bhādrapada* ; or if any one started one's retreat very late after the full-moon of *Asāḷha* due to one's late arrival in company of a caravan (*satthavasena*); or if somebody left the place of one's stay before the full-moon day of *Kārtika*, because the very day might be inauspicious for the *ācāryas* or any other trouble was feared on the day, then one's stay was considered to be of less than four months' duration.[6]

On the evidence of the foregoing discussion, it may be remarked that originally the duration of the retreat of the Jaina Order was two months and ten days only which instead of commencing in the first showers started, as in case of the later (*pacchimikā*) *vassā* of the Buddhist Order, after the expiry of a major portion of it (that is

---

1. *Nis*, 10.40.
2. *Op. cit.*, 8.12, p. 54a.
3. Vide *Infra*, pp. 175-76.
4. *Cūrṇi* to *DasāN*, 8.8, p.53b.
5. Ibid, 7 17-18, pp. 55b-56a.
6. Ibid, 8,9, pp. 53b-54a.

fifty days or sometimes less than that against thirty days of the Buddhists). That both the Orders unanimously professed not to keep the retreat in the first showers is also clear from the above account. In other words the duration of the retreat of the Jaina Order in the beginning and that of the Buddhist Order once for all were fixed to be of seventy and ninety days respectively against hundred twenty days of the total duration of the rainy season. Now it may be remarked that the monks of both the Orders were neither obliged to begin their *vassā* in the beginning of the rains nor were they bound to keep it for the complete rainy season. As these practices were common to both the Orders in the beginning, there must have been some definite motive behind it.

It is an undeniable fact that Indian mendicant life depended mainly on the lay-people for its sustenance and support. It had never been a problem for the devoted persons to accommodate and maintain the mendicants so long as they stayed for a limited period in a village or town. But their continuous stay at one place during four months of the rains, as a matter of fact, might have become a matter of great concern to the lay-devotees. Particularly the Jaina monks might have been a great harassing element to the lay-devotees as their monastic discipline does not permit them even to own a house or a hut for shelter. Naturally the duration of the retreat was cut short by fifty days in order to enable the monks to search out a suitable abode for the *vassā* as up to that period the lay-people were expected to "have usually matted their houses, white washed them, strewn them (with straw), smeared them (with cowdung), levelled, smoothed or perfumed them (or the floor of them), have dug gutters and drains, have furnished their houses, have rendered them comfortable and have cleaned them".[1]

It is just probable that the Buddha, being a contemporary of the Mahāvīra, appropriated the practice with due modifications. In other words, he granted to his Saṅgha the same concession, that is a leave of thirty days against fifty days or less (according to their convenience) of the Jaina Order with a view to meet the same end, noted above. Thus the later period of the retreat, that is to begin the retreat one month after the full-moon of *Asāḷha*, it may be said, owes its origin to the aforesaid rule of the Jaina Order, or to the custom of the Brahmaṇical school.

---

[1] *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 296.

(*ii*) *How to enter upon the Retreat ?*

No direct mention is made in the Pāli Vinaya of the procedure of entering upon the retreat. However a very brief procedure can be deduced from the closing paragraphs of the *Vassūpanāyikakkhandhaka* which may be summed up as below :

One who intended to enter upon the retreat should come to the *vihāra* on the first day of the month after the full-moon day of *Asāḷha* or one month later, prepare himself a lodging place, get drinking water and food ready and sweep the cell. Then he or she should begin the retreat.[1]

Ācārya Buddhaghosa in his commentary on the Vinaya, the *Samantapāsādikā,* supplements this procedure by this formal resolution of the monk—'I will observe the *vassā* for three months in this *vihāra*'.[2]

Besides this procedure, a criterian has also been evolved in the Pāli Vinaya to test the validity and invalidity of entering upon the retreat. As such if anybody, having promised to a lay-devotee to enter upon the retreat at his residence came to the *vihāra* on the *pratipadā* (that is on the first day of the next month after having kept the *uposatha* outside) with a view to observe *vassā* there and left the place on that very day with or without any business, after two or three days with or without any business, after two or three days with a business to be performed within a week and did not return in due time, then his or her entering upon the retreat was not valid. But if a monk or a nun left the place after two or three days with a business to be accomplished within a week and returned to one's former place by the end of the week, then his or her retreat was valid.[3] A person leaving the residence seven days before the *pavāraṇā* was not obliged to return to one's former place.[4]

Like the Buddhist the Jaina sources too do not give any direct procedure of entering upon the retreat. However the monks were asked to wash and clean their clothes and requisites a little before the rain set in.[5] It may be noted that the main problems of the monks as regards the observance of the retreat was that of a proper residence. Accordingly the *Oghaniryukti*[1] gives an elaborate way of searching out a suitable abode. It may however be noted that the monks, in course of their search for a suitable lodge, were always aware of the facilities that a lodge might offer them. In normal circumstances, they sought out a suitable lodge latest by the middle of the month of *Asāḷha.*[2] Having come across a suitable lodge, they first sought permission of the owner,[3] then they, well-furnished with a new bedding (*santhāraya*), a piece of stone or brick (*ḍagala*),[4] ash (*khāra*) and small pots (*mallaya*),[5] etc., set out on the fourteenth of the bright-half of the month of *Asāḷha* so as to reach the residence on the full-moon day of *Asāḷha* latest by the first or the second quarter of the day in order to begin the retreat there.[6] Having come to the residence, it was to be inspected and swept well. If it was time for begging, then someone must be there in the residence to clean it and the rest should go on begging tour for the collection of food and drink.[7]

---

[1] *MV*, 3, 12.24-25. pp. 161-64.

[2] idha vassaṁ upemī ti tikkhattuṁ vattabbaṁ.

[3] *MV*, 3. 12. 24-25, pp. 161-64.

[4] Ibid, 3. 12. 25, p. 164.

[5] *OghN*, 350, p. 131b ; *PindN*, 26, p. 12b.

Normally the monks were expected to settle latest by the fifth of the first fortnight of the month of *Śrāvaṇa.*[8] But it is remarkable that for the first fifty days they did not disclose the duration of their stay to the owner of the house definitely. At the end of every five days, they got the permission of their stay extended by five days. In this manner they continued for the first fifty days, i. e. from the *Āsāḷhī-pūrṇimā* up to the first fifty days of *Bhādrapada* and for the rest of their stay they informed the owner definitely. The monks did so, because if in cases of calamities, etc. they had to depart from the place suddenly, then the owner of the abode might censure them of telling a lie if they had already informed him of their prolonged stay there. Besides, the owner of the lodge mistaking their proclamation of final settlement for the *vassā* as a sign of good rain made every preparation for the ensuing rainy season—he sold the rice in expectation of

---

1. *Op. cit.*, 128-194, pp. 62a-78a.
2. *Cūrṇi* to *DasāN*, 8. 13, pp. 54a-54b.
3. *Āyār* (*SBE.* Vol. XXII), 2. 7. 2. 1-14 (pp. 173-77).
4. In up-to-date language we may call it toilet-paper as it was probably used for cleaning the anus.
5. The Pāli term for *mallaya* or *mallaga* is *mallaka*, e.g. *khela-mallaka*. In modern Magahī dialect it is called *malabā* or *maliyā* and in Bhojapurī *mālī*, and used for keeping oil for the body.
6. *Cūrṇi* to *DasāN*, 8. 13, p. 54a.
7. *OghN*, 182, p. 78a.
8. Ibid, 8. 12-13, p. 54a.

getting a good crops in the new year, thatched his house anew in order to face the onslaught of the heavy rain and mended his plough, etc. for cultivation. As such it was natural for the people to lose faith in the monks, if their hopes and ambitions were shattered in case of draught.[1]

It is evident from the above statement that the procedure of entering upon the retreat of both the systems was almost identical. Both the systems prescribed scanning and sweeping the residence and getting water and food ready. It is also revealed that the monks belonging to both the Orders were not at all prepared to overlook the interests of lay-people or to displease them by their activities and thereby lose their faith and sympathy. Besides these similarities, there were differences too. 'The formal resolution of the monk' was the special feature of the Buddhist way of entering upon the retreat and it was most probably a safeguard against the latitude to break the retreat under certain conditions, so that the monks might not take undue advantage of the same. So also, the Jaina Order put a brake upon the monks by enjoining upon them to come to the residence latest by the second quarter of the day, so that they might not come to the residence very late in the evening or in the night and live there without examining and sweeping the place properly because of darkness.

(v) *The indispensability of the Retreat*

In both the Orders, it was binding on all monks and nuns without any exception to keep retreat. Particularly the Buddhist Vinaya did not permit a monk or a nun not willing to observe it to leave the residence intentionally. If anybody did so, it was an offence on one's part.[2] Even the Buddha and the Mahāvīra observed the rule strictly. Both the sources furnish us with a list of the places where they spent their respective rainy seasons. The places where the Buddha is said to have spent his forty-six successive rainy seasons after preaching the first sermon at Ṛṣipatana-mṛgadāva, the modern Sāranatha were :

No. of *Vassāvāsa*	Name of the places
First	Ṛṣipatana
Next three	Rājagṛha
Fifth	Vaiśālī

---

[1] *Cūrṇi* to *DasāN*, 8. 14-15, p. 54b.

[2] *MV*, 3. 2. 2-3, pp. 144f.

3395-

Sixth	Maṅkula-parvata
Seventh	Trāyastriṁśa
Eighth	Siṁsumāragiri
Ninth	Kauśāmbī
Tenth	Pārileyyaka
Eleventh	Nāla
Twelfth	Verañjā
Thirteenth	Cāliya-parvata
Fourteenth	Śrāvastī
Fifteenth	Kapilavastu
Sixteenth	Āḷavī
Seventeenth	Rājagṛha
Next two	Cāliya-parvata
Twentieth	Rājagṛha
Next twenty-five	Srāvastī
The last one	Vaiśālī.[1]

The following were the places where Lord Mahāvīra observed his rain-retreat since he adopted the life of an ascetic:

First	Asthikagrāma
Second	Nālandā
Third	Campā
Fourth	Pṛsṭhacamā
Fifth	Bhadrila
Sixth	Bhadriyā
Seventh	Ālambhiyā
Eighth	Rājagṛha
Ninth	Rāḍha
Tenth	Śrāvastī
Eleventh	Vaiśālī
Twelfth	Campā
Thirteenth	Rājagṛha
Fourteenth	Vaiśālī
Fifteenth	Vāṇijyagrāma
Sixteenth	Rājagṛha
Seventeenth	Vāṇijyagrāma
Next two	Rājagṛha
Twentieth	Vaiśālī
Twenty-first.	Vāṇijyagrāma

---

[1] *Manorathapūraṇī (Aṅguttaranikāya Aṭṭhakathā)*, 2. 4. 5 ; *Buddhacariyā*, p. 70.

Twenty-second	Rājagṛha
Twenty-third	Vānijyagrāma
Twenty-fourth	Rājagṛaha
Next-three	Mithilā
Twenty-eighth	Vānijyagrāma
Twenty-ninth	Rajagṛha
Thirtieth	Vānijyagrāma
Next two	Vaiśālī
Thirty-third	Rajagṛha
Thirty-fourth	Nālandā
Thirty-fifth	Vaiśālī
Thirty-sixth	Mithilā
Thirty-seventh	Rājagṛha
Thirty-eighth	Nālandā
Next two	Mithilā
Next one	Rājagṛha
Last one	Pāvā.[1]

Rājagṛha, Nālandā, Śrāvastī and Vaiśālī were some of the places where both Lord Buddha and Lord Mahāvīra observed their rain-retreat. Besides, this table reveals a significant point. It is a fact that Lord Buddha considered Magadha, specially Rājagṛha and its suburb, the best place for the spread of his religion as King Bimbisāra had already promised him to patronise his teachings. It was, therefore, natural that in his early career as a religious preacher, the Buddha spent as many as three rainy seasons at Rājagṛha. But in his last days, he preferred Śrāvastī to Rājagṛha and passed the maximum number of his retreat (i. e. twenty-five) there. Most probably the reasons which induced the Buddha to change his preference was the loss of royal favour. King Ajātaśatru who succeeded his father King Bimbisāra is said to be a king with Jaina leanings and as such he might have patronised Jainism. This remark is also corroborated by the fact that Lord Mahāvīra passed the maximum number of his retreat at Rājagṛha and at its adjoining places.

In this connection it may not be out of place to consider the chronology of the Buddha and Mahāvīra on the basis of the lists of the places of rain-retreat of the two teachers. The Buddha spent the twentieth retreat at Rājagṛha, and he was obviously fifty-five (thirty-five+twenty) at the time. He did not pass any rainy season at

---

[1] *Kapp* (*SBE.* Vol. XXII), p. 264; Pt. Kalyan Vigayaji, *Śramaṇa Bhagavāna Mahāvīra, Prastāvanā.*

Rājagṛha during the rest of his life. Mahāvīra renounced the world at the age of thirty and attained enlightenment in the twelfth year of his ascetic life, that is, when he was forty-two. He spent the thirteenth *vassāvāsa* at Rājagṛha, and we find that nine more were passed at the same place during the rest of his life as teacher. This intimate association with Rājagṛha leads one to believe that Ajātaśatru who was a king of Jaina leaning was reigning during the period. If this is the fact, then it may be presumed that Ajātaśatru succeeded King Bimbisāra, when Mahāvīra was forty-two and the Buddha fifty-five, that is Mahāvīra was thirteen years younger than the Buddha. According to tradition the Buddha died at the age of eighty and Mahāvīra at seventy. Thus if our guess is correct, then Mahāvīra died five years after the Buddha. According to the Jaina tradition Mahāvīra died in five hundred twenty-seven B. C., while the *Theravāda* Buddhist tradition places the *mahāparinibbāna* of the Buddha in 543 B. C. Thus while our above calculation shows the interval between the *nirvāṇa* of the two teachers to be five years, the respective traditions make it sixteen years. Of course this is a discripancy, but not too serious to take our conjecture to the realm of impossibility.

(*vi*) *Occasions for the interruption of the Retreat*

Normally a monk or a nun, once he or she entered upon the retreat, was not allowed to go out on tour before the completion of the period. But this rigidity—not to go away during the retreat, could not remain for long, for the cause of the Order suffered a lot because of the stay of the complete Order at one place for three months together. Consequently, the rule was relaxed by the sanction to go out for a week even during the retreat, if anybody is sent for by any one of the seven classes of people, namely, a monk, a nun, a probationary woman (*sikkhamānā*), a novice—male or female (*sāmaṇera* or *sāmaṇerī*), a lay-devotee—male or female (*upāsaka* or *upāsikā*) with a view to accomplish the act of bestowing gifts of *vihāra*, an *aḍḍhayoga* and a *pāsāda*, etc., which have been built by any one of them either for the Fraternity, or for a number or monks, or for an individual monk or nun.[1]

The Order always paid great attention to the interest of the lay-devotees. As such a monk or a nun was allowed to break the retreat for a week, even if such constructions were made for the personal use of the lay-devotees. Besides, if the marriage-negotiation of the son or daughter of an *upāsaka* or *upāsikā* was to be solemnised, or if an *upāsaka* or *upāsikā* was sick, or if he or she knew the recitation of a celebrated *sutta*, etc., then a monk or a nun could also interrupt the retreat for a week.[1] Lastly the retreat could also be interrupted in order to learn the recitation of the *Pātimokkha*, if allowed by the Saṅgha.[2]

---

[1] *MV*, 3. 3. 5-7, pp. 146-48.

It has already been noted that to break the retreat without being sent for was strictly forbidden. A monk or a nun who had interrupted one's retreat on call from any one of the seven types of people, given in the foregoing paragraphs, must return within a week, even if the business had not been accomplished. Very soon after it, a monk or a nun was allowed to interrupt the *vassā* for a week even without being sent for by either of the above noted persons but the *upāsaka* and the *upāsikā* with a view to :

1. wait upon the sick *(gilāna)*,
2. appease the inward struggle (*kukkucca*) of a person,
3. dispell the doubts of conscience *(diṭṭhi)* by religious conversation,
4. (a) endeavour so that the assembly may sentence to *parivāsa*,
    (b) endeavour so that the assembly may sentence to recommence the penal discipline (*mūlāyapaṭikassanā*),
    (c) endeavour so that the Saṅgha may sentence to *mānatta* discipline,
    (d) endeavour so that the Saṅgha may sentence to rehabilitation (*abbhāna*), as the case may be; or
5. endeavour so that the Saṅgha may not proceed against a monk or a nun by any one of the five *kammas*, namely, act of censure (*tajjanīya*), act of guidance *(nissaya)*, act of banishment (*pabbājanīya*), act of reconciliation (*paṭisāranīya*) and act of suspension (*ukkhepanīya*).[3]

A monk or a nun could break the retreat even without being sent for, if a monk, a nun, a probationary woman, a novice—male or female, or one's mother or father was sick.[4] But on account of the sickness of other relatives such as brother and sister, etc., one could interrupt it, only if sent for.[1] Because of a pressing need of the Saṅgha, a monk or a nun was allowed to leave the residence and to come back within seven days.[2]

---

[1] *MV*. 3. 3. 6-8, pp. 147-49.

[2] Ibid, 2. 19. 32, pp. 120-21.

[3] Ibid, 3. 4. 10-14, pp. 149-53.

[4] Ibid, 3. 5. 15, p. 154.

Now what we find is that the circumstances under which the Buddhists interrupted their retreat temporarily were offer of building by lay-people for the use of an individual member of the Saṅgha or the Saṅgha in general, the solemnisation of a ceremony, and invitation by lay-people to attend a feast, the illness of one's relatives and the other *saṅgha-kammas* (ecclesiastical acts). The Jaina monks, on the contrary never availed such privileges. Neither they possessed any building nor the right to attend a ceremony or feast. So also, they could not promote intimacy with a householder, not even with their parents. As such the Jaina Order did never find any occasion to allow such latitudes as in case of the Buddhist. However in case of pressing need, the monks could leave their residence and could go out even to four or five *yojanas*[3] but they must spend the night in some intermediate place, not at the end of the journey.[4]

(vii) *Conditions for permanent transfer of the residence*

There were occasions too on which the residence was to be transferred permanently by monks belonging to both the Orders. A study of these occasions would reveal that both the Orders, more or less, had the same end in view when ordaining so. To be clear, it was safety of life, physical as well as moral.

As already stated, a monk or a nun who once entered upon the retreat must not be inconvenienced in any way. Accordingly the Pāli Vinaya allowed to change the residence permanently;

1. if there was any danger to life through beasts or snakes, etc.,
2. if the neighbouring village was feared to be ruined by fire, etc.,
3. if the residence had been destroyed by fire, etc ,
4. if the neighbouring village had been transferred to another place through fear of robbers, etc.,
5. if sufficient and sustaining food or medicine was not easily procurable, or

---

[1] *MV*, 3. 6. 16, pp, 154-55.

[2] anujānāmi, bhikkhave, saṅghakaraniyena gantuṁ sannivatto kātabbo ti–Ibid.

[3] Vide *Infra*, p. 188.

[4] *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 310.

6. if there was the possibility of endangering the purity of life either through worldly temptations or through schism in the Order.[1]

Though the monastic discipline of the Jainas did not allow to be away from the place of stay for more than a single night in the rainy season,[2] still under exceptional circumstances it allowed the monks to change their residence permanently. It may be remembered in this connection that the Jaina Order was more particular in this respect than the Buddhist as it allowed three abodes for the *vassā*.[3] Thus a monk was allowed to go to another place with a view to learn a celebrated text (*ṇāṇaṭṭhayāe*) from an *ācārya* undertaking a fast unto death (*saṁlehaṇa*), or for the diffusion of the faith (*daṁsanaṭṭhayāe*), or in order to preserve purity of conduct (*carittaṭṭhayāe*), or in case the *ācārya* or the *upādhyāya* was dead (*āyariyauvajjhāyā vā se visuṁbhejjā*), or in order to wait upon the *ācārya* and the *upādhyāya* if they were sick (*āyariyauvajjhāyāna vā bāhitā veāvaccaṁ karanatāte*).[4]

Along with these, a monk or a nun could also change his or her lodge during the rains :

1. if there was divine calamity (*asive*),
2. if there was scarcity of alms (*omoyarie*),
3. if there was trouble from the king (*rāyaduṭṭhe*),
4. in case of fear from thieves, etc. (*bhaye*),
5. in case of illness of a co-monk, etc. (*gelaṇṇe*),
6. in case of mental trouble (*abaha*),
7. if the residence had been destroyed by flood or by fire or by wind (*āu teu vāu*),
8. if that place had come under the sovereignty of another king (*saṅkamite*),
9. if there was any fear of disrespect (*omāṇe*),
10. if the lodge had been occupied by serpents and ants, etc. (*sappa kunthu*),
11. if the village had been transferred to another place (*uṭṭhāna*),

---

[1] *MV*, 3. 7. 17-18, pp. 155-57.

[2] *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 310.

[3] Ibid, pp. 309-10.

[4] *Ṭhān*, 413, p. 308b.

or 12. if there was paucity of a suitable place for answering calls of nature (*thaṇḍilassasti*).[1]

Almost the same terms and conditions for permanent transfer of the lodge are referred to in the Niryuktis.[2]

(*viii*) *Places fit for observing the Retreat*

It is clear from the foregoing discussion about the circumstances under which the transfer of residence was permissible that a place of stay for the retreat of the *Śākyaputtiya* monks should be such that one who entered upon the retreat might not be disturbed or inconvenienced in any way. It was therefore befitting that they settled during the rains where each one's companions lived.[3] If not possible, a pinnacled house (*aḍḍhayoga*), a *vihāra*, a storeyed building (*pāsāda*), an attic (*hammiya*) and a cave (*guhā*) were some of the fittest places where the retreat could be kept with full reliability as these were the best suited for all types of persons. The retreat could also be observed in a cattlepen (*vaja*), stable or mobile. A caravan (*sattha*) and a ship (*nāva*) were also deemed fit for the purpose. But these types of residence were regarded as not fit for all types of persons. At the same time they were not wholly reliable.[4]

That the retreat was not to be observed in a place open to difficulties, troubles or dangers to life, has already been stated. As such to enter upon the retreat in hollow trees (*rukkhasusira*) or on branches of tree (*rukkhaviṭabhiyā*) was prohibited. In the same way to keep retreat in open air (*ajjhokāse*) was also forbidden. So also the retreat culd not be kept either without a resting place (*asenāsanika*) or in a house meant for dead bodies (*chavakuṭika*) Lastly a sun-shade (*chatta*) and an earthenware vessel (*cāṭi*) were also deemed unfit for observing retreat.[5] Besides, a residence where nobody was competent to recite the *Pātimokkha* abridged or in full was also unbefitting for the retreat.[6]

Now we come to the Jaina side.

The Jaina monastic discipline invariably insisted on non-violence and purity of conduct. Each and every rule, therefore, is regulated

---

1. *NisB*, 3127-3130.
2. *Vav*, 1.21; *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 60 (pp. 309-310); *Dasā*, 7 (p. 47b); *OghN*, 7 (*Vṛtti* pp. 14-22a); *BṛhkB*, Vol. III, 2738-39.
3. ettha tumhe, bhikkhave, samante veeāliṁ yathāmittaṁ yathāsaṁdiṭṭhaṁ yathāsambhattaṁ vassā upetha-*DN*. Vol. II, p. 79.
4. *MV*, 3.9.20, pp. 158-59.
5. Ibid, 3.10.21, p. 159.
6. Ibid, 2.19.32, p. 121.

by these two principles. At the very outset we should bear in mind that the second principle is more inclusive than the first, though they are relative. The practice of non-violence means purity of conduct and purity of conduct stands for the practice of non-violence plus the practice of other rules of pure conduct. The only course open to the monks, if they wanted to avoid injury altogether, was the least movement during the the rainy season when the earth was beaming with all sorts of living beings. Two pressing necessities which enabled the monks to go about in the rainy season were collection of alms and answering calls of nature. It is said that the monks had to go to the *thaṇḍila* (privy) many times during the rainy season as they suffered from indigestion in case they took their usual diet. Therefore the best remedy to avoid movement was to keep complete fast during the rains. If not possible, then the monks should take only as much food as was sufficient to keep them alive. It was because of this that their movement was restricted to a *yojana* and a *krośa* all around their residence and even less than that, if there was any perenial river in the way which could not be crossed by putting one foot in the water and the other in the sky.[1] So also, the monks were very particular about the place for answering calls of nature. Wherever they might had been they inspected it beforehand as they feared to hurt themselves or to inflict injury to living beings by stumbling or falling down.[2] The monks were likely to go astray, if they came in close contact with the lay-people. They were, therefore, repeatedly warned not to promote intimacy with a householder.[3] A study of the places fit for observing *caturmāsa* would also affect the same impression to a considerable degree.

We know that a place containing living beings, eggs and cobwebs was not befitting to the monks for their stay.[4] Besides, a place where there were scarcity of alms and paucity of a place for answering calls of nature was also deemed unsuitable to the monks.[5] So also, a residence above ground like a pillar, a railed platform, a scaffold, a storeyed building and a flat roof were regarded unfit for the monks to live in.[6] Similar was the case with underground lodging-places,

---

1. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 297.
2. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.2.3,24 (p. 134).
3. Ibid, 2.2.1 8-12; 2 2.2.1-4, (pp. 122-26).
4. Ibid, 2.2.1.1, (p. 120).
5. In such cases a monk or a nun is allowed to change his or her place of stay–Vide *Supra*, p. 183.
6. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.2.1.7 (p. 122).

halting-places, garden-houses, family-houses and monasteries as these places were often frequented by other ascetics.[1]

So the mendicants generally halted in gardens (*ujjāna*) or temples (*ceiya*).[2] Further they preferred secluded places like caves, forests, roots of trees, deserted houses and burning grounds to residences specially built for monks, places which were likely to make the monks passionate, regions which had no king or regions where the king was wicked.[3]

When considered in the light of the above remarks, the injunction that "when a monk or a nun knows that in a village or scotfree town, ..., there is a large place for religious practices or for study; that there can easily be obtained a stool, bench, bed or couch, or pure, acceptable alms; that there had not come nor will come Śramaṇas and Brāhmaṇas, guests, paupers and beggars; that the means of existence are not small......, they may remain in such a village, ..., during the rainy season"[4] seems to be justified. Two consecutive retreats were not to be observed at the same place.[5]

Now it may be asserted that so far as the places fit for observing the *vassā* were concerned, the Buddhists and the Jainas were poles' apart. As already noted, the Jainas condemned all such places which were above ground while the Buddhists strongly recommended them. Similar was the case with underground halting-places. Though the Jainas are also referred to have halted in gardens, yet as their intention was to avoid injury even to vegetable beings so they disapproved garden-house, particularly during the rainy season as vegetation grow immensely in this season. On the other hand such habitations were very favourite to the Buddhist as a number of their monasteries, namely, Veluvana-vihāra of Rajagṛha, Jetavanavihāra of Śrāvastī, etc. were situated in gardens. Lastly the Jainas also disapproved family-houses and monasteries or places visited by all sorts of people. Along with others, if there was any, this difference was due to the fact that the Jainas gave more stress on non-injury rather than on self-convenience whereas the Buddhists were more particular about the latter.

---

1. *Āyār* (*SBE.* Vol. XXII) 2.2.2.6 (p. 126).
2. *Vivāgasuyaṁ*, p. 77; *Antg*, p. 41; *Aṇuttarovavāiyadasāo*, p. 67; *Uttar*, 18.4; 23.4 & 8; *Nāyā*, p; 69.
3. *Mūl*, 10.58-60; *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 1.7.2.1 (p. 64); *Uttar*, 2.19-20; 32.16.
4. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.3.1.3 (pp. 136-37).
5. *Dasv*, *Cūliyā*, 2.11.

(ix) The Saṅgha-kammas performed during the Retreat

Though the monks as well as the nuns were not as much free to move in the rainy season as in the dry seasons, yet *saṅgha-kammas* (ecclesiastical acts) did not suffer much on this account.

Particularly the Buddhist Order had sanction to do almost all *saṅgha-kammas* even during the retreat period. As such disciplinary and disputatious *saṅgha-kammas* like *parivāsa*, *mānatta*, *tajjanīya*, etc., and non-disciplinary and non-disputatious *saṅgha-kammas* like *pabbajjā*, *upasampadā* and *uposatha*, etc., were performed as usual.[1]

The Jaina Order, on the contrary, was a bit strict regarding admission to the Order as it did not admit everybody during the rains. Only those who were highly experienced and exceptionally qualified such as kings, ministers of kings and the like were received during the *vassā*.[2] Other duties such as confession (*paḍikkamaṇa*), uprooting of the hair (*loya*), etc. were done as usual and even more severely.[3]

(x) Corporate life

The Buddhist monk in normal circumstances did not remain alone either in the rainy season or in seasons other than it. So also, the Jaina monks. Particularly the *ācāryopādhyāya* and the *gaṇāvacchedaka*, two officers of the Jaina Order, were asked to keep retreat at least with two and three persons respectively.[4] But nobody was allowed to stay with a householder or a heretic even in the rainy season.[5]

In cases of trouble and danger only, a Jaina monk or a nun was allowed to remain alone.[6]

(xi) Some privileges due to the Institution of the Retreat

If the institution of the rain-retreat caused some restrictions and limitations upon the conduct of the monks and the nuns during the rainy season, it also entailed some extra provision and duplication of their requisites in the rainy season.

---

1. *MV*, 3.4.10-14, pp. 149-53; 3.11.22, pp. 159-60.
2. *Cūrṇi* to *DasāN*, 8.35, pp. 58b-59a.
3. *DasāN*, 8.34, pe 58b; *NisB*, 3107.
4. *Vav*, 4.5-8.
5. *Nis*, 10.46; The *Ācārāṅgasūtra* gives in detail the reasons as to why a monk should not halt in a lodge used by a householder or by other mendicants belonging to other sects. 2.2.1.8-12; 2.2.2.1-8 (pp. 122-27).
6. *OghN*, 7, p. 13b.

The Buddhists were granted rain-robes (*vassikasāṭika*) in the rainy season.[1] Moreover, they were given the right to use their allotted lodging places exclusively during the retreat period and also to retain it for the next retreat.[2] The supervisor of new buildings (*navakammika)* was privileged with the right to keep one good lodging place under his exclusive possession during the retreat.[3]

Though both to accept new clothes as well as to hoard requisites during the rainy season was prohibited,[4] yet the Jaina Order, along with other facilities, doubled the requisites of occasional use (*aupagrāhika)* in the rainy season.[5]

To collect food and drink once a day was the ordinary rule. But a monk or a nun could also go on begging-tour for the second time in case of fast in the rainy season or in case the food obtained was not sufficient.[6] One could also use the maximum number of *paḍalas* (a piece of cloth to cover the pot), that is seven during the rains against five and six during the summer and winter respectively.[7]

So also, they were to seek out three lodges for the *vassā*, one for regular use and the rest in case of emergencies.[8] Along with it, they could also use stool, bench, bed and couch, etc., which in normal circumstances, could be used in case of sickness and old-age only.[9] Besides, a *vāsattāna* (umbrella),[10] a *pāyalehaṇiā* (a wooden instrument used for wiping out mud from the feet),[11] *mallayatiga* (three pots for depositing excreta, urine and cough),[12] a *ḍagala* (a small piece of stone or brick)[13] and a *kuḍamuha* (a pot to keep the medicine or to deposit excreta of the ill),[14] etc. could also be used freely during the rains.

---

1. *CV*, 2.1.1, p. 68.
2. Ibid, 6.7.25, p. 263.
3. Ibid, 6.11.30, p. 269.
4. na ca varṣāsvabhinavavastragrahaṇaṁ, na cādhikaḥ parigrahaḥ–*Vṛtti* to *PindN*, 25, p. 12a.
5. *OghN*, 726, p. 217b.
6. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol XXII), pp. 298-310; *OghN*, 414, p. 151b; *HJM*, pp. 250 f, 307.
7. *OghN*, 700, p. 212b.
8. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), pp. 309-10.
9. *Vav*, 8.2.
10. *OghN*, 30, p. 31a.
11. *OghN*, 26, p. 30b.
12. *DasāN*, 8.13, p. 54a.
13. Ibid.
14. *BṛhkB*, Vol. IV, 4263.

(xii) *Some special features of the Jaina Retreat*

Besides the foregoing account which are more or less common to both the Orders, the Jaina retreat is marked by some special rules as regards travel during the rainy season. Though the monks and the nuns strictly adhere to one place during the rains, still they resume travelling even during this period, though not as freely as in the dry seasons.[1]

As the monks always intended to abstain from inflicting injury to living organism so they usually travelled through a dry road as it was deemed free from living beings.[2] In other words they preferred a road much used by men and women, carts and chariots, elephants and horses, camels and asses, and cows and buffaloes or a path heated by sun or ploughed for cultivation[3] to a road with a shaky wooden bridge or with a slab or brick for crossing over the watery or the muddy places.[4] If necessary, they could take resort to watery or muddy road as well, but in that case they should try to cross it, if possible, with the help of stones kept firmly in the water. If not so, then they should go through the water flowing over stones (that is through high regions), or flowing with mud (*mahusittha*), or over sand (*valua*), or over thick mud (*kaddama*).[5] In one word they should try to cross it through shallow water.

In order to avoid killing the mendicants normally wiped their bodies thoroughly before stepping into the water. They also tried to go straight by putting one foot in the water and the other in the air and without being touched by or touching anybody.[6] So also, they sought the help of householders or in their absence that of a stick called *nālikā* for crossing over the water which was navel-deep (*nābhipramāṇa*). Coming to the shore, either they stood there till their clothes stopped dripping water or took themselves to some other place with due care, if the place was fearful (*sabhıya*).[7] They never brushed their muddy feet against the grass in order to clean them.[8]

The mendicants were allowed boat-travel. But they were not to use a boat owned by their host. Before getting into a boat, the

---

1. *Kapp* (*SBE*, Vol. XXII), p. 130.
2. *OghN*, 23-25, pp. 29a-30a.
3. A monk should not go straight if there is living beings on the road–*Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.3.1.7, p. 137.
4. *Dasv*, 5.65.
5. *OghN*, 32-33, p 32a.
6. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.3.2.9-10 (p. 143).
7. *OghN*, 34-36, pp. 32b-33a.
8. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.3.2.12 (p. 143).

mendicants examined their requisites, wiped their bodies and threw away the householder's food.[1] Then they got into the boat in between some people. So also at the time of getting down. They took their seats on either side of the boat.[2] The use of a boat for bad purposes was not allowed.

In no case a monk or a nun was allowed either to pull the boat forward or backward, or to row it, or to throw water out of it, or to cover its leakage.[3] A mendicant was allowed to cross a river by means of a gourd (*tumba*), if the boat was not available and the water was crossable.[4]

Sometimes it so happened that the boatman threw them into the water. In that case they could swim to the shore leaving their requisites in the water, if necessary. Coming to the shore, they should remain there with moist body till it got dried up. In no case they should wipe or brush it in order to get it dried soon.[5]

In normal circumstances, five great rivers, the Gaṅgā, Jamuṇā, Saraū, Erāvatī and Mahī, could not be crossed either by a boat or by swimming twice or thrice within a month. But the same could be done in case of trouble from the king *(bhataṁsi)*, or famine *(dubhikkhaṁsi)*, or if thrown into the water *(pavvahejja vā naṁ koi)*, or in case of flood or change of course of the river *(daoghaṁsi vā ejjamānaṁsi mahatā)*, or trouble from wicked persons *(anāritesu)*.[6] Shallow water could be crossed over fourteen times in all, seven times going and seven times back, during the rainy season, whereas only six, three times going and three times back, in the dry seasons *(uḍubaddha)*.[7]

Normally travelling in rain or mist was not permissible. But if rain set in while the mendicants were on tour, they were asked to take resort to a nearby place or to a lonely house or a tree, if they had travelled very far off. In case of slight or heavy rain, they were allowed to use umbrella (*vāsattāna*) and to climb a dried up tree respectively. So also, in case of sudden flood or overflowing of rivers, they were permitted to travel by a bridge or to cross it by swimming.

---

1. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.3.1.13-14 (p. 139).
2. *Vṛtti* to *OghN*, 36-38, pp. 33a-33b.
3. *Āyār (SBE*. Vol. XXII). 2 3 1.16-21 (pp. 139-141); *Nis*, 18 1-20.
4. *OghN*, 38, p. 33b.
5. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.3.2.2-7, pp. 141-42.
6. *Ṭhān*, 412, p. 308b.
7. *DasāN*, 8.27, p. 56b.

(*xiii*) *Conclusion*

That the custom of rain-retreat is as old as the Brahmaṇical mendicancy is obvious. Now the problem which attracts our attention is—How did the idea of rain-retreat come into the mind of the Jainas and the Buddhists ? Had it been their invention or a simple imitation of the custom prevailing at the time ? In this connection we must confess the truth that in absence of sufficient and proper proofs we cannot pass any categorical remark as regards its introduction in the Jaina Order. The Buddhists, on the other hand, themselves admit that they borrowed it from the heretics who were already observing it, very likely, with a view to avoid injury to vegetation. In the 6th century B.C. two religions that came forward as staunch advocates of *ahiṁsā* were Jainism and Buddhism. It was perhaps Jainism which strictly upheld that vegetation has life. On this evidence we may infer that very likely it was the Jaina retreat which acted as a model for the Buddhists This is further corroborated by the fact that the Jaina and the Buddhist retreats, besides the necessary points of disagreement, have many things in common which have already been spotted out at the places concerned.

Besides, the institution of the rain-retreat proved to be of immense benefit to both the Orders. It was during the four months of the rainy season only that the monks and the nuns lived corporate and stagnant life. During the remaining eight months, a major portion of their time was spoiled in touring from one place to another. This prolonged and regular journey was not only fatiguing and troublesome to them, but also debarred them from taking up any concrete step for the progress of the faith or for self-enlightenment. The *vassāvāsa* thus not only saved them from the fatigue and exertion of journey and offered them rest and shelter, but also gave them an opportunity for constructive work and spiritual edification.

SECTION III

PAVĀRAṆĀ

The solemn stay at one place during the four months of the rains is closed by a conference of the mendicants called *pavāraṇā*. *Pavāraṇā* is understood, firstly, as 'closing'[1], because it is the *uposatha* held specially at the close of the *vassāvāsa*; and secondly, as 'invitation'[2], for every monk or nun present in the meeting invites one's companions to remind him or her of the offence seen, heard or suspected during the *vassāvāsa*. Thus the confession of one's lapses and shortcomings is the soul of *pavāraṇā*. The elaborate rules laid down as regards the procedure of *pavāraṇā* are, only with some indispensable variations, mostly identical with those of the *uposatha*, already discussed.[3] It seems, therefore, useless to work out the details once more. But a few facts which may lead one to confusion and misunderstanding must be made clear. We must bear in mind that *pavāraṇā* unlike the *uposatha*, was not to be performed necessarily on the day of termination of the period of the *vassāvāsa*. Sometimes it was postponed to the *komudi cātumāsinī*,[4] if there was any difficulty in its solemnisation or if the monks were unwilling to quit their lodge. In any case it must be performed within a week after the expiry of the term of the *vassāvāsa*.[5] Like the *uposatha*, *pavāraṇā* too was originally proclaimed by the monks on behalf of the nuns. But ultimately the nuns themselves were authorised to proclaim their *pavāraṇā* before the assembly of monks.[6]

The nearest approximate Jaina concept corresponding to *pavāraṇā* is *khamāvaṇā* (*kṣamāpaṇā*). Originally this Jaina ceremony was performed at the end of the *pajjusana* period, i. e. on the fifth of the

---

1. In this connection the remark of Prof. Louis Renow is worth noticing– "The last day of the period of wandering life is marked by a general confession, which thus terminates the active part of the religious life and also coincides with the end of the Jaina year; this confession is the counterpart of the Buddhist confession that marks the end of the rainy season and constitutes a feature of what is known as the *pavāraṇā* or 'closing' ".*Religions of Ancient India*, p. 128; Cf. *EBJ*, p. 142.
2. Vide *EBJ*, p. 143; *Book of Discipline*, Vol. IV, p. 211 fn 2.
3. Vide *Supra*, pp. 159-65.
4. Vide *EBJ*, pp. 142-43; Cf *MV*, 3.12.25, p. 163.
5. *EBJ*, p. 181.
6. *CV*, 10.12.25-27, pp. 395-97;

bright-half of the month of Bhādrapada, and lasted for one day only. This day is also called *Saṁvatsarī*, i. e. the most auspicious day of the year which is also the closing day of the year. Once Kālakācarya[1] is referred to have performed it one day before the due date, i.e. on the fourth of Bhādrapada, and since then this day was also assigned to *pajjusana*. Later on the Śvetāmbara sect however began to hold it eight days earlier, i.e. on the twelfth of the dark-half of the month of Bhādrapada and continued it up to the fifth of the bright-half of the month of Bhādrapada. The influence of Kālakācarya on this sect cannot be denied as it virtually, even at present closes the celebration one day earlier, i. e. on the fourth of Bhādrapada. The Digambara sect on the other hand began on the fifth and continued it for nine days more, i. e. to the fourteenth of Bhādrapada. They avail this occasion of cultivating the tenfold virtues, namely, *kṣamā* (forgiveness), *mārdava* (humility), *ārjava* (simplicity), *satya* (truth), *śauca* (purity and cleanliness), *saṁyama* (control over the mind, body and speech), *tapa* (fasting and austerities), *tyāga* (non-attachment), *akiñcanatva* (ideas of non-possession) and *brahmacarya* (chestity);[2] and accordingly they call it Dasalakṣaṇaparva. This practice—to begin a festival a few days earlier than the due date or to continue it even after the expiry of the due date, is not unusual. Even nowadays a centenary or any other festival is either preceded by some ceremony or followed by any such celebration.

The festival begins with the decoration of the monastery and in some cases also accompanied by pompous procession. Every Jaina visits the monastery daily and takes part in the services there. Besides, the pious ones avail this opportunity of keeping fast for several days, performing *posadha* for two days and practising meditation at the monastery. On the closing day of the festival, a Jaina, as a rule, refrains from taking food and drink and the monastery abounds with people performing confession and asking forgiveness from their acquaintances for offences done to them deliberately or otherwise. Thus the festival comes to its close. This is in brief the confession and act of apology made by the Jaina laity.[3]

This is a feature which the Jaina monks share with the Jaina laity. After the fulfilment of the term of *cāturmāsa*, the monks normally sought permission of the owner of the house before vacating the place of their stay. If they could not, it was natural for the householder that he might lose faith in them or might censure them of indecent behaviour, or might suspect them to be associated with the thieves, if by chance theft was committed just after their departure from his house. There was, therefore, every likelihood that he might not accommodate them in his house again. Along with it, the departing monks were asked not to behave so as to make the householder's wife (*sijjātarī*) weep bitterly as it was likely to create suspicion in the mind of the householder that his wife had illicit connection with the monks. The people, on the other hand, might condemn the monks to be in relation with the householder or his wife on account of his or her lamentation.[1]

---

[1] Vide *Kapp.*, *Kālakācāryakathā.*

[2] Stevenson, *Heart of Jainism*, pp. 151-54.

[3] Ibid. pp. 259-60.

Further, the monks were asked not to tell the owner of the lodge their sudden decision to go as it might cause suspicion in his mind. They were also not to disclose to him their exact date of departure, because the householder and his family, putting aside their everyday activities on that day, might arrange a luxurious feast for them. As such the *ācārya*, having despatched some monks to seek out the next suitable place of stay, gave a hint to the owner of the place of the sudden decision to depart from the place[2] by reciting the following verses:

"Sugarcanes have overgrown and the gourds are plump and glossay,
The bulls have attained vigour and the villages are not slushy,
The roads contain less water and the earth is dried up,
The roads are full of traffic, (so) it's most opportune for monks' walk."[3]

Then the *ācārya*, after performing the *paḍikkamaṇa* (confession) and *āvaśyaka* in the evening, informed the owner of the house of his decision to go next morning and preached a religious sermon to him and his family. Normally the monks performed both *suttaporisī* and *atthaporisī*[4] before their departure from the place. But in case they had to cover a long distance, then they did *suttaporisī* only and made

---

1. *BṛhkB*, Vol. II, 1533-1536.
2. Ibid, 1537-1538.
3. ucchū volimti vaim, tumbio jāyaputtabhamḍāo.
   vasahū jāyatthamā, gāmū pavvāyacikkhallū,
   appodagā ya maggā, vasuhā vi ya pakkamaṭṭiyā jāyā,
   annokkamta pamthū, viharaṇakālo suvihiyāṇam.
   —Ibid, 1539-1540.
4. Performing *sūttaporisī* means reading the text or taking lesson from the *gurū*. *Atthaporisī* stands for reading the text or taking lesson from the *gurū* with explanation. *Cūrṇi* to *BṛhkB*, Vol. II, 1543; *Vivṛtti* to *OghNB*, 173.

to their way to the next stop early in the morning even without scanning their requisites[1] as was usually the case.[2]

Now it may be gathered that the confession of faults committed during the four months of rains is the nucleous of the ceremony of the Buddhist *pavāraṇā* and the Jaina *pajjusana*. Neither the Buddhists nor the Jainas seem to be rigid as regards the exact date of observance of the ceremony. They make necessary adjustment according to their convenience and suitability shortly after the end of the period of the rain-retreat. One peculiar characteristic of the Jaina *pajjusana* is that it is also observed by the laity. This is a feature which does not obtain with the Buddhists.

---

1. *BṛhkB*, Vol. V, 1541-1543.
2. *Uttar*, 26.22f.

CHAPTER IV

MONASTIC ADMINISTRATION

Section I

The Custodians of Monastic Discipline

Section II

The Laws of Polity

Section III

The Buddhist Prātimokṣa & The Jaina Prāyaścitta : A Comparative Study

CHAPTER IV

MONASTIC ADMINISTRATION

Now we come to the most significant aspect of an organisation *viz.*, administration, which, no doubt, destines the success or otherwise of an institution—secular or religious. The Buddhist Order was a highly organised institution and was, beyond any shadow of doubt, managed and governed purely on democratic lines. Naturally a study of the *Vinayapiṭaka* reveals that most of the essential features of a democratic or republican organisation like moving of a motion (*ñatti*), reference to a select-committee (*ubbāhikā*) for arbitration, use of secret ballots (*salākās*), quorum and the election of the president are patent throughout in the constitution of the Buddhist Church. It is one of the numerous features of the Buddhist monachism which enabled an eminent scholar to opine that "The laws of polity by which the early Buddhist *Saṅghas* were governed......have passed through several stages before reaching that systematic completeness which characterize them in the *Vinayapiṭaka*"[1].

The Jaina Order, like the Buddhist, too, was one of the well-organised religious institutions that ever flourished in India. At the very outset it may be stated that the Jaina Order, in contrast with the Buddhist, adopted autocratic form of government from its very beginning. Lord Mahāvīra himself, for instance, is referred to have grouped his following into nine *gaṇas* (groups) which were placed under the direct supervision of eleven *gaṇadharas* (group-leaders).

The foregoing remarks bear evidence to the fact that the Buddhist and the Jaina Orders should have very little in common so far as their administrative aspect is concerned. Nevertheless, we dare hunting up the points shared in by both the Orders and also pointing out the features peculiar to one or the other system.

The monastic administration as it is to be examined here may conveniently be taken up under three categories which will follow one after another in course of this chapter. The three categories in question are :

(a) The Custodians of Monastic Discipline,
(b) The Laws of Polity, &
(c) The Buddhist *Prātimokṣa* and the Jaina *Prāyaścitta* : A Comparative Study.

---

[1] *EBM*, p. 137.

The only concern of the first section will be to examine the various *Saṅgha* units and the hierarchy of officers along with their duties, obligations and requisite qualifications. The laws of polity, as a matter of fact, is a wide term, and, therefore, may comprise all the rules regulating manners and deportment of a monk. Thus the laws in this section fall under two main categories, the one relating to food and drink, dress and sanitation, diseases and cures,......in brief, the laws pertaining to day-to-day life of a monk, and the other as regards transgressions and expiations, offences and punishments, disputes and the procedure with which they are dealt, etc. Here it may be clearly stated that this section will be devoted to the discussion of the rules coming under the second category only as the rules comprising the first have, more or less, already been dealt with.[1] The last section will be confined to the discussion of the groups of transgressions and expiations stated as the rules of *Prātimokṣa* and *Prāyaścitta* by the Buddhists and the Jainas respectively.

---

[1] Vide *Supra*, Chapter II.

SECTION I

THE CUSTODIANS OF MONASTIC DISCIPLINE

In the beginning the Buddhist mendicants had no fixed dwelling. They travelled from place to place in batches, staying for a short while in caves and forests. As these batches were not separate units, the members belonging to a particular batch or group were not obliged to stick to that very batch or group. They could join, according to their desire and convenience, any batch they liked. What we propose to emphasise is that the Buddhist monks, though they travelled in groups, were one organic whole. Accordingly, whatever rule was in force was meant for each and every member of the Order without any distinction. But this state of affairs could not remain for long. Very soon, they, because of their swarming number, were constrained to give up their itinerary habits. That is, they began to lead stationary and corporate life at a particular place which gave rise to the Buddhist *āvāsas* and *saṅghārāmas*. At first these *āvāsas* together formed the original *Cātuddisā-Bhikkhu-Saṅgha*. In due course, the spread of the faith to different quarters of the country handicapped the monks in carrying out the ecclesiastical acts. Consequently, the extension of an *āvāsa* was limited by fixing its boundary (*sīmā*) which ultimately led to the formation of different units like the local *Saṅgha* and others.

1. The Church Units

(*a*) *Buddhist*

The *Saṅgha* and the *gaṇa* were the two units of the Buddhist church worthy of reference here.

The word *Saṅgha* which means assemblage or multitude was known to India long before the advent of the Buddha. Normally, the Buddha applied it to denote his whole Priesthood and thus assigned it one of the highest distinctions. But even in his lifetime, it began to denote, sometimes, the whole community of monks and nuns, and many times a part of it only. Besides, it also stood for the quorum or minima of monks required for the transaction of a *saṅgha-kamma*.[1] Despite the fact, it is, however, certain that it was the largest unit of the Buddhist Fraternity.

---

[1] Vide *Infra*, pp. 213-14 for the quorum required for different *saṅgha-kammas*.

Another unit of the Buddhist Brotherhood is *Gaṇa*. The commentator defines it as a group of four or more than four monks. In the words of Prof. Childers, "*Gaṇa* as applied to an assemblage of priests is, like *Saṅgha*, used in a wide and somewhat vague sense, being applied alike to the whole priesthood, and to so small a number as five".[1]

Thus the details as regards the *Saṅgha* and the *Gaṇa* are so meagre and vague that it is very difficult to draw a sharp line of distinction between the two.

(*b*) *Jaina*

It is well-known that the Jaina monks led itinerary life staying not more than five consequitive nights at a particular place in the dry seasons. The practice is more or less in vogue even nowadays. It was because of this that the Jaina priesthood was divided into a good number of groups and sub-groups prominent among which were the following.

The largest and the most ancient unit of the Jaina priesthood was *Gaṇa*. We have already stated that Lord Mahāvīra is said to have divided his Church into nine *Gaṇas*. In spite of the fact, as the explanation supplied by the commentators differ immensely from one another, it is difficult to form a clear-cut idea about the *Gaṇa*. At one place it is said to have been a batch of monks having common reading,[2] while at other simply a group of *Kulas*[3] or *Saṁbhogas*,[4] while still at other a synonym for *Gaccha*.[5]

Besides, we also come across references to the exact number of monks, a *Gaṇa* consisted of. They were three,[6] five,[7] or thousand[8] for the maximum.

---

1. Childers, *Pali English Dictionary*, *Sub voce*.
2. samānavācanākriyāḥ sādhusamudāyaḥ–Comm. to *Samv*., p. 14b.
3. gaṇāti kulasamudāyaḥ, Comm to *Ṭhān*. p. 516a; According to the Comm. to *Bhag* , p, 382b, a *gaṇa* consists of three *kulas; BṛhkB*, Vol, I, 492-93; Comm. to *Aup* , p. 81.
4. *Bṛhk*, 4.18-20.
5. Comm. to *Ṭhān*, p. 331b; gaṇo gacchaḥ tasya copagrāhitā, pp. 340a, 386a, etc.
6 *Mūl*, 10.92.
7. ekaikasmin gaṇe pañca pañca puruṣā bhavanti-*Vṛtti* to *BṛhkB*, Vol. II, 1438.
8. Utkarṣataḥ puruṣapramāṇam sahasrapṛthakatvam-*Vṛtti*. to *BṛhkB*, Vol. II, 1443.

The next important unit of the Jaina Priesthood was *Kula*. We have just seen that the *Kulas*, i. e., groups of monks having a common teacher[1] formed the *Gaṇa*. The implication of *Kula* as it is equated with *Anvaya*[2] and also with *Gaccha*,[3] a synonym of *Gaṇa*,[4] is, like the *Gaṇa*, somewhat vague and indistinct.

Next to *Kula* was *Saṁbhoga*. That it was a group of monks taking food together[5] is apparent from the very title. Jacobi regards it as 'a group of monks begging alms in one district only'[6]. According to another explanation, it was a group of monks having common *sāmācārī*[7] or rules of conduct peculiar to each group. Naturally, exchange of requisites, common study, mutual reverence and service etc. were permissible to monks belonging to the same *Saṁbhoga* only.[8]

It is normally believed that *Sāhās* or *Sākhās* were "the lines which branched off from each teacher".[9] The names given to various *Sākhās* also show that the *Sākhās*, apart from the lines which cropped up from each teacher, were groups of monks belonging to a particular region or place, or were schismatic factions named after the place[10] where they seceded from the Church.

The *Gaccha* even though later in origin is always equated with *Gaṇa*.[11] From this and its other explanations[12], it is clear that *Gaccha*, like *Gaṇa*, was one of the largest units. Our statement is further corroborated by Dr. Deo's plea for the omission of the word from the Chedasūtras.[13]

---

1. egāyariyassa santai–Comm. to *Bhag*., 382b.
2. Comm. to *Uttar*, p. 168b.
3. Comm to *Ṭhān*, p. 516a
4. Ibid, pp 241b, 331b, 353a, 381a where the *Gaṇa* is explained as the *Gaccha*.
5. Comm. to *Ṭhān*, p 139a; Comm. to *Uttar*, p. 333a.
6. *Suyg* (*SBE*. Vol. XLV), p 167, fn. 1; *Uttar*, 29.33; *Nis*, 5.63; *Vav*, 6.19f; 7 2-5; etc.; Schubring, *Doctrines of the Jainas*, pp. 251-52.
7. *Pāiasāddamahaṇṇavo*, p. 1062.
8. *Samv*, 12, p. 21b,
9. *Kapp* (*SBE*, Vol. XXII), p. 288, fn. 2.
10. *Cf*. list of *Gaṇas* and *Sākhas* in the *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), pp. 288-294.
11. Comm. to *Ṭhān*, pp. 241b, 331b, 353b, 381b.
12. ekācaryaparivāraḥ, *Aup*, p. 86; sabālavṛddhakulaṁ gacchaṁ-*Gacchācāra*, 22.
13. "The *Chedasūtras* like *Vyavahāra*, *Niśītha* and *Bṛhatkalpa* seldom speak of a *Gaccha*, and it may be, that with the spread of Jainism, smaller groups than the *Gaṇa* were found to be more convenient both for Church administration and for the purpose of touring life." *HJM*, p. 232.

In due course the size of the *Gaccha* was miserably reduced and accordingly was called '*gurūparivāra*', the following of a particular *ācārya*, consisting of three[1], four or five monks.[2] Not only this but the *Gaccha* was also divided into smaller units like *Gumma* and *Phaḍḍaya.*[3]

Maṇḍalī was a small unit of monks assigned with the duty of service to an ill, or to help an old or a young monk, or a novice or a prince or the like.[4] This explanation of the term led Dr. Deo to observe that the *Maṇḍalī* was simply a cooperative unit,[5] rather than a unit in the technical sense.

"It is not quite clear" says Jacobi, "what is meant by *Gaṇa, Kula,* and *Sākhā*. *Gaṇa* designates the school which is derived from one teacher, *Kula* the succession of teachers in one line, *Sākhā* the line which branched off from one teacher. These terms seem to be disused in modern times, for the four principal divisions called after Nāgendra, Chandra, Nivṛtti, and Vidyādhara are generally called *Kulas*, but also occasionally *Sākhās.* They go back to Vajra according to some, to Vajrasena according to others. The modern *Gaccha* appears equivalent with the *gaṇa*".[6] Now on the evidence of this analysis of the different Church units, it may be inferred that the *Gaṇa*, alone was the original and the largest unit of the Jaina Order. *Kula* and *Saṁbhoga* were simply sub-units of *Gaṇa*. *Gaccha* and *Sakhā*, the former being a synonym for *Gaṇa* and the latter a schismatic faction, were of late origin because they are not referred to in the Aṅgas and the Mūlasūtras.

(c) Conclusion

Now what we find is that the *Gaṇa* is a unit common to both the Orders. This unit of the Jaina Priesthood, like the Buddhist, consisted of monks as less as five or sometimes three and as much as thousand or above. Another unit which finds more or less, its counterpart in the Buddhist Order is *Saṁbhoga*. It is true that the term *Saṁbhoga* is not directly referred to as a specific unit of the Buddhist Brotherhood. What is adverted to is *Samānasaṁvāsaka*, i. e., a group of monks belonging to the same communion. *Samanasaṁvāsaka* monks like that of the monks belonging to the same *Saṁbhoga*, were

---

1. *BṛhkB*, Vol, II, 1630.
2. *Pañcavastuka* as quoted in *Pāiasaddamahaṇṇavo*, p. 358.
3. *Aup*, p. 86.
4. *OghN*, 553, p. 183b.
5. *HJM*, p. 234.
6. *Kapp* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), p. 288, fn. 2.

bound with the common rules of conduct and were also obliged to perform *Uposatha*, etc. together.[1]

2. Hierarchy of Officers

(*a*) *Buddhist*

The Buddhist *āvāsas*, no doubt, were big colonies of monks and nuns When people live together in large numbers many problems arise. The first and foremost problem that comes before a religious organisation is that of moral discipline It mainly consists in imparting proper training to new entrants in the tenets of religious life and keeping strict watch on their conduct so that they may not violate the rules of monastic etiquette. Another influence that it exerts is the problem of material needs. It is well-known that the Buddhist Order, which according to an early tradition, owned no property, was compelled to accept gifts from the laity. An equal and just apportionment of the articles, thus procured, was essential, for peace and order might have been at stake, if favouritism and nepotism would have gained ground in the Brotherhood.

Consequently, a number of officers were appointed from time to time. It was their duty to train up *sāmaṇeras* or to dispose of the articles acquired by the Order. Thus the officers of the Buddhist Order were mainly of two types. The officers forming the first category were those who looked after the moral aspect of the monks and those forming the second category were responsible for the material needs of the Order.

Ācariya and Upajjhāya :—Truely speaking, the *Ācariya*[2] and the *Upajjhāya*[3] were the only officers who were mainly responsible for imparting proper training to novices in the way of monkhood.

The minimum qualifications expected of an *Ācariya* or *Upajjhāya* were at least ten years' standing in monkhood as well as perfect knowledge of moral practices, etc. Besides, he should be conversant with the nature of an offence, and also with the two *Pātimokkha* codes.[4]

It is difficult indeed to distinguish one from the other as the qualifications required of an *Ācariya* or *Upajjhāya* were exactly the same. However, Prof. Oldenberg, on the evidence of the difference in their privileges and obligations, have inferred that the position of an *Upajjhāya* was superior to that of an *Ācariya*. An *Upajjhāya*, particularly at the *Upasampadā* service, had a more prominent role to play than the *Ācariya*. Besides, "the duty of instructing the young Bhikkhus in the holy doctrines and ordinances seems, therefore, to belong to the *Upajjhāya* rather than to the *Ācariya*."[1]

---

[1] *MV*, 1.7.12, p. 111; 1.35.49, pp. 139-40; 10.1.5, p. 372.

[2] Ibid, 1 23.74-78, pp. 56-62; *CV*, 8.13.24-25, pp. 336-40.

[3] Ibid, 1.18.64-66, pp. 42-47; *CV*, 8.11.20-21, pp. 328-32.

[4] Ibid, 1 23.76, p. 57; 1.26.82, p. 67; 1.28-29. 84-85, pp. 67-73.

Thus the *Upajjhāya* was clearly installed higher in position than the *Ācariya*. This fact is further corroborated by the rule that the dependence (*nissaya*) of a monk on his *Ācariya* came to an end, if his *Ācariya* and *Upajjhāya* happened to come together.[2]

Anusāsaka :—The only duty of an *Anusāsaka* was to make the postulant conversant with the etiquette to be observed at the *Upasampadā* service. No mention is made of the qualifications required of an *Anusāsaka*.[3]

Sāmaṇera-pesaka :—A sporadic mention is made of an officer known as *Sāmaṇera-pesaka* (superintendent of novices). What were exactly the nature of his qualifications and duties is really very difficult to opine.[4]

Dhammadhara, Vinayadhara, etc :—Apart from the persons who were engaged in instructing the novices the tenets of monk life, there were *theras* who mastered one or the other branch of Buddhist learning. It was they who imparted a specialised training to the novices in the different subjects of Buddhist scholarship. One mastering the Vinaya was known as *Vinayadhara*, the Dhamma as *Dhammadhara*, the Mātikas as *Mātikādhara*, the Suttas as *Suttantika* and the like.[5]

Some of the designations like *Dhammadhara* and *Suttantika* seem to be synonymous, but as a matter of fact it is not so. At the same time it is also not possible to draw a sharp line of distinction between them. Upāli and Ānanda were the first *Vinayadhara* and the first *Dhammadhara* who recited the Vinaya and the Dhamma respectively in the First Buddhist Council convened just after the demise of the Buddha.[6]

---

[1] *Vinaya Texts* (*SBE*. Vol. XIII), p. 179, fn.

[2] *MV*, 1 27.84, p. 67.

[3] Ibid, 1.68.125-26, pp. 97-99.

[4] *CV*, 6.12.36, pp. 74-75.

[5] The scholarship of a *thera* or *mahāthera* is often referred to in the terms—"bahussuto āgatāgamo dhammadharo vinayadharo mātikādharo paṇḍito ...." Vide, *MV*, 2.19.32, p. 120; 10.1.1, p. 368; *CV*, 12 2.10, p. 421; 12.2.14, p. 423, etc; *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XXXVI, Nos. 2 & 3, p. 116.

[6] Vide *CV*, 11.3.4.4-5, pp.408-409.

The Buddhist Church hierarchy, it has already been remarked, is distinguished from the Jaina by a number of officers who were to look after the material needs of the Order. These officers may conveniently be discussed in three categories, these categories in question being (i) officers in charge of food and drink, (ii) officers in charge of robes and (iii) officers in charge of lodging places.

(i) *Officers in-charge of food and drink*

Bhattuddesaka :—Of the various officers appointed from time to time to look after the problem of food and drink, the *Bhattuddesaka* and the *Khajjabhājaka* occupied a significant position. The *Bhattuddesaka*, in addition to his duties to issue tickets to selected monks in order to send them to the house of a laity, supervised food to be served to the whole community (*saṅghabhatta*), to a particular monk (*uddesabhatta*), invitation (*nimantana*), food allotted by tickets (*salākabhatta*), food served every fortnight (*pakkhika*), on *Uposatha* days (*uposathika*) and on the first day of a fortnight (*pāṭipadika*). The first occupant of this office was Venerable Dabba who performed his duties most successfully.[1]

Khajjabhājaka, etc. :—The office of the *Khajjabhājaka* was in no way less important. It was normally assigned to a senior monk (*thera*) who very likely looked after the dry food to be distributed to the monks.[2]

Besides, officers like *Yāgubhājaka*[3] (distributor of rice-gruel), *Phalabhājaka*[4] (distributor of fruits), *Cīvabhājaka*[5] (distributor of congey), *Paniyavārika*[6] (officer in charge of drinks), etc. also find a reference in the Pāli Vinaya, but details are lacking in their case.

(ii) *Officers in-charge of robes*

Cīvarapaṭiggāhaka, *Cīvaranidahaka*, etc. :—No less than five officers who were busy with the acquisition, preservation and distribution of robes are referred to in the Pāli Vinaya. They were *Cīvarapaṭiggāhaka*[7] (receiver of robes), *Cīvaranidahaka*[8] (care-taker of robes), *Bhaṇḍāgārika*[9]

---

[1] *CV*, 4.2.5-7, pp. 153-55; 6.12.32-33. pp. 272-73.

[2] Ibid, 6.12.34, pp. 273-74.

[3] Ibid, 6.12,34, p. 273.

[4] Ibid.

[5] *EBM*, p. 187.

[6] Ibid, p. 188.

[7] *MV*, 8.11.17, p. 300; *CV*; 6.12.34, p. 273.

[8] Ibid, 8.11.17, p. 300.

[9] Ibid, 8.12.18, pp. 300-301; *CV*, 6.12.34, p. 273.

(store-keeper of robes), *Sāṭiyaggahāpaka*[1] (receiver of under-garments) and *Cīvarabhājaka*[2] (distributor of robes).

The only duty of the *Cīvarapaṭiggahāpaka* was to receive gifts of robes made to the Saṅgha by the laity at the end of *Vassāvāsa*. It was simply the negligence of this officer which led to the formation of the office of *Cīvaranidahaka*. As such the sole duty of this person was to take care of robes made over to the Saṅgha. The next two officers, the *Bhaṇḍāgārika* and the *Sāṭiyaggahāpaka* were most probably appointed to assist the *Cīvaranidahaka* in his duty. The only duty of the last officer, the *Cīvarabhājaka*, was to deal out the robes acquired by the Order.

(iii) *Officers in-charge of lodging places*

Senāsanaggahāpaka, *Senāsanapaññāpaka*, etc. :—A reference is made to as many as four officers who were entrusted with one or other work as regards the lodging places. They were *Senāsanaggahāpaka* (receiver of *vihāras*, etc.), *Senāsanapaññāpaka* (distributor of lodging places), *Ārāmikapesaka* (overseer of *ārāmas*) and *Navakammika* (superviser of buildings).

The sole business of the *Senāsanaggahāpaka* was to accept *vihāras*, etc. on behalf of the Saṅgha[3] and that of the *Senāsanapaññāpaka* to allot a separate lodging place to each and every member of the Order.[4] *Ārāmikapesaka*[5] was perhaps an officer who supervised the work of *Ārāmikas*, the servants employed by the donor to keep the *ārāma* tip top. *Navakammika* was a permanent officer appointed by the Order to supervise the construction or repair of buildings.[6]

Besides, a mention is made of officers who were concerned with one or other thing of daily life. They were *Pattaggāhāpaka*[7] (distributor or alms-bowl), *Bhājana-Vārika*[8] (officer in charge of utensils), *Appamatta-vissajjaka*[9] (disposer of trifles) and the like.

---

[1] *CV*, 6.12.36, pp. 274-75.

[2] *MV*, 8.12.18, pp. 301-302; *CV*, 6.12.34, p. 273.

[3] *CV*, 6.6.24, pp. 262-63.

[4] Ibid, 6.12 34, p. 273.

[5] Ibid, 6.12.36, p. 274; *EBM*, p. 188.

[6] Ibid, 1.4.33, p. 32; 6 3.15-16, pp. 253-54; 6.11.30, pp. 268-71.

[7] *CV*, 6.12.36, p. 274.

[8] *EBM*, p. 189.

[9] *CV*, 6.12.35, p. 274.

Here it is to be noted that the qualifications of all the officers in charge of material articles were the same. They were expected to be impartial (*na chandāgatiṁ gaccheyya*), and not to be misled by anger (*na dosāgatiṁ gaccheyya*), stupidity *na mohāgatiṁ gaccheyya*) or fear (*na bhayāgatiṁ gaccheyya*). Moreover, they must also have a thorough knowledge of the department concerned.[1]

(*b*) *Jaina*

Being a religious organisation, the problem of moral discipline of the Jaina Order was exactly the same as that of the Buddhist. This is why we are told of a good number of officers who were to train up the *sehas* (novices) in the way they should go. The officers who are often referred to in the Aṅgas and the Chedasūtras were *Āyariya*, *Uvajjhaya*, *Āyariyauvajjhāya*, *Gaṇahara*, *Gaṇi* and *Gaṇāvaccheiya*. Besides, petty officers like *Vāyaga* and *Pavatti* are also reffered to.

Āyariya :—The *Āyariya*, of course, occupied the first place in the list, and hence, was one of the most powerful officers of the Jaina Church. From the types[2] of *Āyariyas* as mentioned in the Aṅgas and the Chedasūtras, it may be inferred that the work of initiation, ordination, both initiation and ordination, explaining the text to the disciples, reciting it to them and both explaining and reciting it to them formed the main items of duty binding on the *Āyariyas*. To sum up the *Āyariya* was responsible both for the administrative and educational aspects of the Church. Besides, he was also to manage for the material needs and other legitimate grievances of the monks under him. He must also protect the requisites already acquired by his *Gaṇa*.[3]

It should be noted that the honour and power given to the *Āyariya* were simply in line with his responsibilities. The five privileges (*aïsesa*) which the *Āyariya* was allowed to avail were that he could wipe and clean his feet in the monastery, could answer calls of nature in the monastery, could wait upon somebody or could not do so, could live alone in the monastery for a night or two and could also stay outside the monastery for the same period.[4] So also, in the previous pages it has been recorded times and again that almost all the items of daily duty were to be performed with his previous permission or consent.[5]

---

[1] *MV*, 8.12.18, p. 301; etc.; *CV*, 6.12.33, p. 273; etc.

[2] *Ṭhān*, 320 (pp. 239b-240a) refers to four types of *Āyariyas*, and *Vav*, 10.11-12 to eight types. Also vide *HJM*, pp. 146, 222, 223.

[3] Ibid, 544, p. 385b.

[4] *Ṭhān*, 438, pp. 329ab; *Vav*, 6.2.

[5] Vide *Supra*, pp. 98-9.

Not only monks, even nuns were placed under his guidance and protection. Accordingly, he was counted as one of the three protectors of nuns.[1]

The qualifications that the *Āyariya* should possess were as high as his position. It is said that the *Āyariya* should be at least of eight years' standing in monkhood and should also be conversant with the *Sthānāṅga* and the *Samavāyāṅga sūtras*.[2] Besides, he must be endowed with the fivefold conduct (*āyāra*), namely, knowledge (*ṇāṇa*), faith (*darisaṇa*), good behaviour (*cāritta*), penance (*tava*) and fortitude (*viriya*).[3]

Uvajjhāya[4] :—The *Uvajjhāya* was one of such officers who were entrusted with the duty of imparting instructions to novices. The Aṅgas, in contrast to the Chedasūtras[5] which regarded the *Uvajjhāya* among the three protectors of nuns; gave him an inferior position. According to the commentators it was simply because of the work of teaching that he was called *Uvajjhāya*.[6] It shows therefore that he was concerned only with the educational aspect and was not to interfere in the administration of the Church.

The minimum *parayāya* for this post was three years. Besides, the candidate for this post must be an expert in monastic conduct (*āyārakusala*), in the scriptures (*pavayaṇakusala*), in their exposition (*paṇṇattikusala*), in inducing people to the fold (*saṅghakusala*) and he must also possess the knowledge of *Āyārapakappa*.[7]

Āyariyauvajjhāya :—One of the important officers is *Āyariya-uvajjhāya*. It is very difficult to say whether this expression is simply a compound of the designations of *Āyariya* and *Uvajjhāya*, or denoted altogether a new office. It is because of the fact that even the commentaries are not clear in point.[8] So also the duties ascribed to this officer are not very helpful in this respect, for they are not explicitly mentioned. Prof. Schubring is however of opinion that this person

---

1. *Vav*, 3.12.
2. Ibid, 3.7.
3. *ĀvasN*, 998; Comm. to *Āyār*, pp. 4-5; Comm. to *Ṭhāṇ*, p. 140a.
4. For reference to *Uvajjhāya* : *Ṭhāṇ*, 177, p. 142^{1}; *Āyār* (SBE. Vol. XXII), 2.1.10.1 (p. 113); 2.3.3.4 (p. 146); etc.
5. *Vav*, 3.12.
6. 'upetyādhīyate' smādityupādhyāyaḥ. Comm. to *Ṭhāṇ*. p. 140a; uvaisanti jamhā uvajjhāyā teṇa vuccanti. *ĀvasN*, 1001.
7. *Vav*, 3.3-4.
8. Comm. to *Ṭhāṇ*, pp. 329b, 331b; Comm. to *Bhag*, 232a.

held a position in between the *Āyariya* and the *Uvajjhāya*.[1] Dr. Deo has discussed this issue in detail. He remarks that "The commentaries[2] understand by this mostly two persons[3] and in few cases where the word is used in plural, perhaps the view is correet"[4]. But the *Vyavahārasūtra*, he further points out, "treats him as a single person, superior to the *Uvajjhāya* in point of standing in monkhood (*pariyāya*), as well as in study, as he was expected to have studied the three *Chedasūtras—Dasā* (*Daśāśrutaskandha*), *Kappa* (*Bṛhatkalpa*), and *Vavahāra* (*Vyavahārasūtra*)".[5] So he holds, "that he acted as an *Āyariya* when the latter was absent, and as an *Uvajjhāya* when the real *Uvajjhāya* was busy with something else. Thus he seems to have served as a link between the *Āyariya* and the *Uvajjhāya*".[6]

Thus the qualifications required for this post were at least five years' experience as a monk and the knowledge of the *Daśāśrutaskandha*, the *Bṛhatkalpa* and the *Vyavahāra*.[7] In case such a person was not available, then even a person whose *pariyāya* had been cut short due to some offence committed by him was installed in the office,[8] if he was deemed otherwise fit for the post.[9] If he was not remembering the aforesaid texts, then he had to learn at least the *Āyārapakappa*.[10]

The privileges to be enjoyed by this officer were similar to those of the *Āyariya*.[11] It was due to this exalted position of the *Āyariyauvajjhāya* that the commission of any offence against celibacy or giving up the robes (*avadhāvai*) while in the office made him unfit for holding any office throughout his life. In case he committed these offences after leaving his office, then he forfeited his claim for three years only.[12]

Thus it is clear that the qualifications for the post of *Āyariyauvajjhāya* were higher than that for the *Uvajjhāya* and lower than that for the *Āyariya*. It seems therefore that the *Āyariyauvajjhāya* was an officer superior to the *Uvajjhāya* and inferior to the *Āyariya*. This exalted position of the *Āyariyauvajjhāya* is also manifest from the privileges he was allowed to enjoy exclusively.

---

[1] Schubring, *Doctrines of the Jainas*, p. 255.
[2] *Vav*, 4.11f.
[3] Cf. *Ṭhāṇ*, p. 329b; *Bhag*, p. 232b.
[4] *Vav*, 1.31.
[5] *Ibid*, 3.5.
[6] *HJM*, pp. 219-20.
[7] *Vav*, 3.5.
[8] Ibid, 3.25.
[9] Ibid, 3.9.
[10] Ibid, 3.10.
[11] Vide *Supra*, p. 208.
[12] *Vav*, 3.16-17; 3.21-22.

Gaṇahara :—The *Gaṇahara* or the group-leader was the name given to the chief and direct disciples of a Tīrthaṅkara. No mention is made in the texts proper either of the qualifications or of the duties of this person.[1] For example, even the *Vyavahārasūtra* which prescribes the qualifications of other officers is silent in this respect “But, if on account of this absence of the statement of qualifications of a *Gaṇahara* we take him to be identical with the *Āyariya*,” remarks Dr. Deo “then we cannot account for the separate mention of *Gaṇahara* along with the *Āyariya* and others[2] in the list......”[3]. But as a matter of fact, this issue does not seem to be too difficult to be explained. It is just probable that the Order, out of respect for the nomenclature given by the Tīrthaṅkaras themselves, might not have deemed it proper to use the same for the officers appointed by itself. The Order therefore might have changed it by some other designation. Having the high standard of morality, outstanding scholarship and engaging personality of the *Gaṇaharas* of Mahāvīra in view, it may not be unjustified to remark that the *Āyariya* would have been the only officer to replace the *Gaṇahara*. Hence, the possibility that the *Gaṇahara* and the *Āyariya* were identical cannot be ruled out.

Gaṇi :—One more officer who appears to be identical with the *Gaṇahara* was *Gaṇi*. The *Gaṇi*, like the *Gaṇahara* or the *Āyariya*, was the head of a group of monks.[4] It is however difficult to account for the separate mention of this officer as not only his duties were almost identical with that of the *Gaṇahara* or the *Āyariya*, but he is also equated with them.[5] This fact is further stressed on by the *Āvaśyakaniryukti* which refers to Indrabhūti, the chief *Gaṇahara* of Mahāvīra as the *Jiṭṭhagaṇi*.[6]

The qualifications that a *Gaṇi* must have are known as *Gaṇisampayā* (Skt. *Gaṇisampadā*). *Gaṇisampadā* is eightfold[7], namely, *āyārasampayā* (qualification of good conduct), *suyasampayā* (qualification of

---

1. For *Gaṇahara* Vide *Supra*, pp. 25-6.
2. *Bṛhk*, 4.15.
3. *HJM*, p. 225.
4. gaṇo yasya astīti. Comm. to *Ṭhān*, pp. 143a–144a.
5. Comm. to *Ṭhān*, p. 422b & *PindN*, 315, p. 98a equate him with *Āariya*; *DasāN*, 4.27-28, p. 16b with *Gaṇahara*.
6. *ĀvasN*, 556.
7. *Ṭhān*, 601, p. 422b; *Dasā*, 4th *dasā*; Vide also, *Dasv*. *Cūliyā*, 2.9.

learning), *sarīrasampayā* (qualification of physical fitness), *vacanasampayā* (qualification of oratory), *vācanāsampayā* (qualification of recitation), *matisampayā* (qualification of developed intellect), *payogasampayā* (practical experience) and *saṅghasampayā* (experience in inducing people to the monastic fold). Thus the *Gaṇisampayā* comprise almost all the qualities that a good leader or administrator should possess.

Ganāvaccheiya :—*Gaṇāvaccheiya* who came next to *Āyariyauvajjhāya* in position was the head of a part of the *Gaṇa.*[1] Eight years' standing in monkhood and the knowledge of the *Sthānāṅga* and the *Samavāyāṅga sūtras* were the necessary qualifications required of this person.[2] But due consideration was shown for those forgetting the texts due to illness or old age.[3] Even a learned person was deemed unfit for this post, if he was a liar, deceitful (*māi*) and sinful.[4] If a person, while holding this post, committed any offence against celibacy[5] or left the Order,[6] he was debarred from this privilege for the whole life. But a person doing the same after quitting one's office was suspended for three years only.[7]

Though this officer was expected to live with two other monks in the dry season[8] and with three others in the rainy season,[9] yet he was allowed to stay even outside the monastery for a day or two.[10] Thus this person commanded great respect and confidence of all the monks of his *Gaṇa.*

Besides, *Vāyaga* and *Pavatti* were two officers who were to look after the affairs of the Church. *Vāyaga* was perhaps an officer who gave reading to newly admitted monks[11] and was held on par with the *Uvajjhāya* in rank.[12] The *Pavatti* held a position next to the *Uvajjhāya.*[13]

As a rule, the Order of nuns whether Jaina or Buddhist was controlled by a monk of unimpeachable morality. Though Aryā Candanā is stated as the head of nuns forming the following of

---

[1] desoasyastiti gaṇāvacchedakaḥ. Comm. to *Ṭhāṇ*, p 245a; Schubring, *Doctrines of the Jainas*, p. 254.

[2] *Vav*, 3.7.

[3] Ibid, 5.17-18.

[4] Ibid, 3.24.

[5] Ibid, 3.14.

[6] Ibid, 3.19.

[7] Ibid, 3.14; 3.20.

[8] Ibid, 4.3-4.

[9] Ibid, 4.7-8.

[10] Ibid, 6.3.

[11] Cf. Vāyaṇāyariya-*Vav*, 10.11-12

[12] *Pāiasaddamahaṇṇava*, p. 944.

[13] *Bṛhk*, 4.15.

Mahāvīra, it is just probable that she occupied a position in the Jaina Church hierarchy comparable to that of Mahāprajāpati Gautamī in the Buddhist. Out of the numerous male officers of the Jaina priesthood, only the *Āyariya* and the *Uvajjhāya* wielded power over the nuns.[1] The Chedasūtras refer to female officers like *Gaṇiṇī*,[2] *Pavattiṇī*[3] and *Gaṇāvaccheiṇī*[4], who took care of the Order of nuns. It may however be stated that their qualifications, duties and responsibilities were almost similar to those of *Gaṇi*, *Āyariya* and *Gaṇāvaccheiya* respectively and as such they held the same position in the Order of nuns as the latter three in the Order of monks.[5] Though we come across in the Buddhist Canon with nuns like Puṇṇā and others who brought several persons to senses, yet none of them are clearly referred to as the leader of the Order of nuns.

(c) *Conclusion*

Thus we see that the Jaina Church had a galaxy of officers who were responsible for the supervision of monks. But from the scanty and confusing accounts at our disposal, it is indeed difficult if not impossible to ascertain the position of at least some of the officers in the Jaina Church hierarchy. To serve as an illustration, we may refer to the cases of *Āyariya* and *Gaṇāvaccheiya*, whose qualifications[6] and conditions for suspension from the office[7] were the same and as such we see no reason why should the latter be regarded inferior in position to the former.[8] The Buddhist Order vied with the Jaina so far as the number of officers is concerned, but one would be disappointed in one's search for an officer whose position has not been clearly indicated. The status of the *Upajjhāya* and the *Ācariya*, the only two officers of the Buddhist Church hierarchy responsible for the moral training of a monk is clearly distinguished. The former, unlike the Brahmaṇical[9] and the Jaina[10] traditions, is held higher in position than the latter. So also, the position of officers concerned with the material needs of the Order is in no case interposing.

---

[1] *Vav*, 3.12; *Supra*, pp. 207-8

[2] *BṛhkB*, Vol. V, 6048; *Gacchācāra*, 127-28.

[3] *Bhag*, 334, pp. 375b; *Bṛhk*, 1 41f; 3.13; 4.1f; etc.; *Vav*, 5.1f; 5.1-2; 5.9-10; 5.13-14; 5 17.

[4] *Vav*, 5.3-4; 5.9-10; *BṛhkB*, Vol III.

[5] Vide *HJM*, pp 468-470.

[6] Vide *Supra*, pp. 2 7-8, 211.

[7] *Vav*, 3 9; 13, 23-29.

[8] Dr. Deo takes the *Gaṇāvaccheiya* as inferior to *Āyariya*. *HJM*, pp. 223-24.

[9] upādhyāyāndaśācārya ācāryāṇāṁ śataṁ pitā /
sahasraṁ tu pitṛnmātā gauraveṇātiricyate //
Manu, 2.145; Vide also *Yāgñavalkya*, 1.35.

[10] Vide *Supra*, pp. 207ff.

SECTION II

THE LAWS OF POLITY

(A)Buddhist

From the preceding discussion of the duties and power assigned to the officers of the Buddhist Order, it is now clear that the officers truly speaking were granted almost no personal authority. Even the excercise of the little authority vested in them was deemed valid, if exercised with the consent of a duly constituted Saṅgha. Particularly a "transaction which might affect the Saṅgha in any way" was to be performed with the help of a complete Saṅgha formed lawfully, and hence, was aptly called a *saṅgha-kamma* (ecclesiastical act). For a classified list of the various forms of *saṅgha-kammas* adverted to in the *Vinayapiṭaka* we may refer to Dr. Dutt's, "*Early Buddhist Monachism*", pages 148-49, were the learned scholar has aptly classified the *saṅgha-kammas* in two main categories, *viz.*, (a) Disciplinary and disputatious *saṅgha-kammas* and (b) Non-disciplinary and Non-disputatious *saṅgha-kammas*. The *saṅgha-kammas* like *Parivāsa*, *Mānatta*, *Tajjanīya*, etc., fall under the first category, while *Pabbajjā*, *Upasampadā*, *Uposatha*, etc., in the second.

A complete and lawful Saṅgha consisted of all the monks living within the *sīmā* of an *āvāsa*, excluding the *sāmaṇeras*, the monks belonging to another *āvāsa* and the monks undergoing some sort of punishment for some omission or commission.[1] The absentee must also either make themselves present at least by proxy or go out of the jurisdiction of the *āvāsa*.[2] In later times, the cases of the *āvāsas* not sufficiently populated led to the fixation of the minima required for the transaction of the various *saṅgha-kammas*. The reason was that an *āvāsa* inhabited by less than four monks was denied the status of a full-fledged Saṅgha competent to transact any of the *saṅgha-kammas*. Thus the minimum number of monks constituting a valid Saṅgha, fixed according to the nature of the *saṅgha-kammas* to be performed, is given thus in the *Mahāvagga*:[3]

i. Four monks for all acts except *Upasampadā* and *Abbhāna* (re-admission of a monk into the Saṅgha after *Parivāsa*),

---

[1] *Op. cit.*, 10.1.5, pp. 371-72.

[2] Vide *Supra*, pp. 163ff.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 9.4.9-13, pp. 334f; *CV*, 1.1.5, p. 7.9.

ii. Five monks for all acts except *Upasampadā* and *Abbhāna* in the Middle Countries (Majjhima Janapada),[1]
iii. Ten monks for all acts except *Abbhāna*,
iv. Twenty monks or more for all acts.

As already noted, the ecclesiastical acts to be transacted by a lawful Saṅgha may conveniently be studied under three categories, these categories in question being (a) the transaction of the Non-disciplinary and Non-disputatious *saṅgha-kammas*, such as, *Upasampadā*, *Uposatha*, settlement of *sīmā*, appointment of officers, and the like, (b) imposition of appropriate penalty and (c) the decision of the ecclesiastical disputes (*adhikaraṇa*).

A lawful transaction of a *saṅgha-kamma*, whether legal or otherwise, important or insignificant, must necessarily be accompanied with a *ñatti* (motion), *anussāvanā* or *kammavācā* (proclamation of the act proposed) and *dhāraṇā* (resolution). In important cases known as *ñatticatutthakamma*, the proclamation is made thrice, in simpler cases called *ñattidutiyakamma* only once. As for example, the proclamation, while ordaining a novice or inflicting punishment on a guilty person or dealing with a disputed matter, is to be announced thrice and in case of fixation of *sīmā* or appointment of officers once only.

Though every monk, as a rule, is entitled to express his view on the issue *sub judice*, yet for moving the motion and making the necessary statements, an individual monk is selected who represents the whole Saṅgha. The rest, if they agree with the proceedings, express their consent by remaining silent, if not, give reason for their disagreement. Nobody is allowed to misuse this personal privilege by raising legal question unnecessarily in the assembly.[2]

(a) *The Transaction of Non-disciplinary and Non-disputatious Acts*

This is the normal principle applied by the Saṅgha which holds good in all cases, whatever. Now let us see the details which are peculiar to each of the aforesaid three cases. So far as the transaction of the Non-disciplinary and Non-disputatious *saṅgha-kammas* are concerned, they have no technical peculiarity of their own. For instance, the case of ordaining a novice (which belongs to the *ñatticatutthakamma*) may be taken. In this case the *Anusāsaka* introduces the person seeking ordination along with his proposed *Upajjhāya*. Then the postulant himself requests the Saṅgha for ordination. Thereupon a qualified and learned monk moves the motion and announces the *kammavācā* thrice which is assented to by the monks by keeping silence. This procedure has been discussed in deatail in the first section of the second chapter. The fixation of *sīmā*[1] and appointment of officers[2] are the two typical examples of *ñattidutiyakamma*. In the first case, the Saṅgha fixes the boundary marks and then announces the same to the assembly once for its formal approval, while in the latter, the *kammavācā* is proposed after seeking the consent of the monk to be posted to the office. This is in brief the procedure adopted in case of the transaction of a Non-disciplinary and Non-disputatious *saṅgha-kamma*.

---

[1] Vide, Law, *Geography of Early Buddhism.*

[2] Vide *MV*, 2.14-15.22-23, pp. 116-117.

(b) *Offences and Punishments*

The *Vinayapiṭaka* contains a comprehensive list of offences to be committed by monks which are known as the rules of *Prātimokṣa*. They are classified in eight groups in descending order of their seriousness and are provided with suitable punishments But really speaking only six[3] of them come under the offences proper, which are as follows :

	Offences	*Punishments*
(i)	Pārājika	Expulsion from the Saṅgha,
(ii)	Saṅghādisesa	Suspension : (a) Mānatta (b) Parivāsa (probation) : (i) Apaṭicchanna (unconcealed)[4] (ii) Paṭicchanna (concealed)[5] (iii) Suddhanta (complete purification)[6] (iv) Samodhāna (inclusive probation)[7],

---

[1] *MV*, 2.4.7-9, p. 109.

[2] Ibid, 8 11-12.17.18, pp. 300-302; *CV*, 4.2.6, pp. 153-54, etc.

[3] Vide *Infra*, p. 229.

[4] It seems that only *Mānatta* was inflicted in case of an unconcealed offence like emission of semen. (Cf. *CV*, 3.1.1-3, pp. 86-87). If concealed, the offender had to under go *Parivāsa* and accordingly was called *Paṭicchanna-parsvāsa* Again if a monk under probation for his concealed offence committed the same offence and did not conceal it he had to observe the *Paṭicchannaparivāsa* afresh (Cf. *CV*, 3.1.14-15, pp. 93-94) and perhaps this was the probation for an offence not concealed.

[5] *CV*, 3.1.6-7, p. 89; 3.1.12-13, pp. 92-93.

[6] Ibid, 3.2.60-63, pp. 122-24.

[7] Ibid, 3.1.29-30, pp. 102-103.

(iii)	Nissaggiyā	Forfeiture,
(iv)	Pācittiyā	Expiation,
(v)	Aniyatā	Expulsion, Suspension or Expiation,
(vi)	Pāṭidesaniyā	Confession.

Besides, a sporadic mention is made of offences like *Thullaccaya*, *Dukkaṭa*, *Dubbhāsita*, etc., which are prescribed no specific penalty.[1]

To punish the transgressor was out and out an ecclesiastical act. The measures often carried out against a guilty person were as follows :

A disciplinary measure known as *Taijanīyakamma* was carried out in case of a monk who was quarrelsome; full of offences; closely associated with householders; lacking in morality; ill-speaker of the Buddha, the Dhamma, or the Saṅgha; or the like. Imposition of this penalty made the trangrsessor incapable for certain ecclesiastical acts.

The second disciplinary measure called *Nissayakamma* was taken against a monk who partook in ecclesiastical acts, even though guilty of minor offences. The monk in question was subjected to subordination and was also denied some ecclesiastical rights and privileges.

The third measure or the *Pabbājanīyakamma* was normally carried out against a monk who was defamed as *kuladūsaka* (defiler of good families) and *pāpasamācāra* (given to had conduct) by his overt actions of garlanding or partaking in playing, singing and dancing with young girls. The monk *sub poena* was compelled to leave the place for some time and to observe the disabilities as well.

The fourth measure, the *Paṭisāranīyakamma* was inflicted upon a monk who had given offence to a householder by contemplating loss to him; reviling him; censuring the Buddha, the Dhamma, or the Saṅgha; or by any other similar act. The penalty consisted in compelling the monk to beg pardon of the householder. He was also allowed a companion duly appointed by the Saṅgha in order to assist him in his act of begging pardon of the householder. The companion when he found that the householder was not willing to forgive the monk begged pardon of the householder on behalf of his friend or of the Saṅgha as he deemed proper. The sentence was revoked as soon as he was pardoned by the householder.

The fifth and the last was *Ukkhepanīyakamma* or the act of suspension. When a monk refused to acknowledge his offence or to atone for it or to renounce a false or sinful doctrine, this measure was carried out. The guilty monk was denied association with the resident monks in all possible ways.

---

[1] Vide *Infra* pp. 237f.

It is to be noted that the procedure adopted in all the cases was the same which may be summed up as below:

First, the guilty monk was to be warned (*codetabbo*), then reminded of the *Pātimokkha* rule which he was infringing (*sāretabbo*) and then charged with the offence incurred by him (*āpattiṁ āropetabbo*). This was followed by the *ñatti*, 'so and so was guilty of such and such an offence' and the request for taking necessary steps, announced thrice before the Saṅgha. The guilty monk was given an opportunity to defend himself or to confess his guilt before finally inflicting the penalty on him.

The penalty which consisted of debarring the guilty monk from conferring *Upasampadā*, giving *nissaya* to a monk, taking a *sāmaṇera*, taking part in any ecclesiastical act, etc , was the same in all cases, except in the *Ukkhepanīyakamma* in which the guilty person was denied even association with his co-monks and the privileges like receiving salutations, courtesies, services, etc , from other monks and so on and so forth. The penalty continued for an indefinite period. It was revoked when the monk *sub poena* requested for it to the Saṅgha.

Other rules as regards the number of valid and invalid acts, Saṅgha's choice to proceed against a guilty person revocable and unrevocable cases were almost the same for all acts. The following table[1] contains the number of the same :

	No. of unlawful acts.	No. of lawful acts.	Saṅgha's choice.	Restrictions imposed.	Unrevocable	Revocable.	Persons on whome inflicted.
Tajj-K.	12	12	6	18	18	18	Paṇḍuka, Lohitaka.
Niss K.	12	12	6	18	18	18	Seyyasaka.
Pabb-K.	12	12	14	18	18	18	Assaji, Punabbasuka.
Paṭi-K.	12	12	4	18	18	18	Sudhamma.
Ap. Ad. Ukk.-K.	12	12	6	43	43	43	Channa.
Ap. Ad. Ukk.-K.	12	12	6	43	43	43	Channa.
Pa. Ap. Ukk.-K.	12	12	6	43	43	43	Ariṭṭha.

---

[1] For reference to the informations of this sub-section vide *CV*, chapters 1 to 3; *EBM*; pp. 165ff; *EMB*, pp. 298-304.

Besides these, measures like *Mānatta*, *Parivāsa*, *Mūlāyapaṭikassanā*, *Brahmadaṇḍa*, etc., were also taken against a guily monk.

Mānatta and *Parivāsa* were inflicted for *Saṅghādisesa* offences. The monk undergoing the *Mānatta* discipline was debarred from the usual privileges of the Saṅgha for six days. *Mānatta* was also accompanied by *Parivāsa* when the offence was concealed knowingly and when it was not possible to ascertain the date of commission of the offence. The former was known as *Paṭichannaparivāsa* and the latter *Suddhantaparivāsa*. The period of *Parivāsa* extended for the commission of a fresh offence during the *Parivāsa* period for the previous offence was called *Samodhānaparivāsa*. When the monk *sub poena* failed to observe the restrictions imposed on him for *Mānatta* or *Parivāsa*, he had to undergo the penalty prescribed for the latter offence afresh.[1] *Brahmadaṇḍa* or the penalty of social boycott had been inflicted on Channa in the first Buddhist Council.[2]

(c) *Settlement of Disputes (adhikaraṇa)*

On certain occasions a legal issue of the Saṅgha became a topic of hot discussion and great controversy. All such controversial issues are said to have arisen because of four reasons, *viz*, *vivāda* (contention), *anuvāda* (censure), *āpatti* (offence), and *kicca* (duties and obligations of the Saṅgha), and are named accordingly—*Vivādādhikaraṇa*, *Anuvādādhikaraṇa*, *Āpattādhikaraṇa*, and *Kiccādhikaraṇa*.[3]

(i) *Vivādādhikaraṇa* includes, excepting family and friendly disputes, all such disputes arising out of contention relating to Dhamma, Vinaya, the teachings—preached, practised or promulgated by the Tathāgata, and the nature of an offence. For example, the contention arising out of Yasa's suggestion that accepting money from the laity is unlawful may be put forward here.[4]

This type of offence was agreed upon by *Sammukhavinaya* (proceeding in presence) and *Yebhuyyasikā* (verdict of the majority).

(ii) *Anuvādādhikaraṇa* includes disputes arising out of censure as regards moral habits (*sīla*), good conduct (*ācāra*), right view (*diṭṭhi*) and right mode of livelihood (*ājīva*). Disputes arising due to family and friendly censure are beyond its province. The allegation that Yasa propounded a false doctrine to the householders is an instance in point.[5]

---

[1] For details vide *CV* chapters 2nd, 3rd; *Infra*, pp. 232-34.

[2] *CV*, 11.8.10-13, pp. 412-14; *DN*, Vol II, *Mahāparinibbānasutta*.

[3] Ibid, 4.8.31-43, pp. 170-177.

[4] Ibid, 12 1.1, p 416.

[5] Ibid, 12.1.2, pp. 416-17.

A dispute belonging to this group was settled by four types of decision, *viz.*, *Sammukhavinaya* (proceeding in presence), *Sativinaya* (proceeding for the innocent), *Amuḷhavinaya* (proceeding for past insanity) and *Tassapāpiyyasika* (trial for the prevaricators).

(iii) *Āpattādhikaraṇa* comprises disputes arising from any one of the offences, namely, *Pārājika*, *Saṅghādisesa*, *Nissaggiyā*, *Pācittiyā*, *Pāṭidesaniyā*, *Thullaccaya*, *Dukkaṭa* and *Dubbhāsita*, alleged against a monk. The complaint lodged by Bhikkhunī Mettiyā against Dabba that he has assaulted her criminally is a typical example.[1] Any other *āpatti* like *sotāpatti*, *samāpatti*, etc., is out of the jurisdiction of *Āpattādhikaraṇa*.

Disputes forming this group were settled by three forms of decision, *viz.*, *Sammukhavinaya* (proceeding in presence), *Paṭiññātakaraṇa* (trial for the confessor) and *Tiṇavatthāraka* (the proceeding of covering up with grass).

(iv) *Kiccādhikaraṇa* arises from the procedure of a *saṅgha-kamma*, i.e., from the duties and obligations of the Saṅgha. The allegation made against the Chavaggiya monks that they carry out formal acts of censure, guidance, banishment, reconciliation or suspension against monks who are not present is a typical example of the kind.[2]

The duties and obligations to an *Ācariya*, an *Upajjhāya* and fellow-monks having the same *Ācariya* or *Upajjhāya* cannot be the subject-matter of *Kiccādhikaraṇa*.

The only form of decision applied for the reconciliation of *Kiccādhikaraṇa* is *Sammukhavinaya*.

An *Adhikaraṇa*, to whatever category it may belong, is settled by a duly appointed Saṅgha. The trial is governed by the rules of *Adhikaraṇasamathā* which are seven in number—(i) *Sammukhavinaya*, (ii) *Sativinaya*, (iii) *Paṭiññātakaraṇa*, (iv) *Amuḷhavinaya*, (v) *Yebhuyyasikā*, (vi) *Tassapāpiyasikā*, and (vii) *Tiṇavatthāraka*.[3]

(*i*) *Sammukhavinaya*[4] :—The procedure is carried out in the presence of (a) a complete Saṅgha, (b) the Dhamma, (c) the Vinaya, and (d) the persons involved in, hence the name *Sammukhavinaya* (proceeding in presence). This "fourfold presence" is necessary in the trial of all *adhikaraṇas* without any distinction. Normally the trial

---

1. *CV*, 4 2.8-9, pp. 155ff.
2. Ibid, 4.1.1, p. 150.
3. For important views on the seven *Addhikaraṇasamathas* vide *EBM*, pp. 156-65; *EMB*, pp. 307-10.
4. *CV*, 4.1.1-4, pp. 150-52; 4.9.44-51, pp. 177-84.

ends with the decision of the dispute by a complete Saṅgha constituting of the members of the *āvāsa* concerned. In case the local Saṅgha fails to settle it, then it approaches the members of a nearby *āvāsa* for arbitration who accept it only if they consider themselves competent for the assignment. If unable to decide the case, they return the custody of the case to the disputant monks who again refer the question to a select-committee (*ubbāhikā*) duly appointed out of the monks of their own *āvāsa*. The monks who form such a Saṅgha must be qualified and virtuous.

As a matter of fact, the text lacks details as regards the actual proceeding of the trial applied by the committee. Dr. S. Dutt assumes the procedure adopted in the Second Council as an instance in point.[1]

(*ii*) *Sativinaya*[2] :—The proceeding for the innocent is applied when a monk is baselessly charged with the breach of morality. The person concerned is made to appear before the Saṅgha to deny the charge, if conscious of his innocence and to request the Saṅgha for acquittal usually in the words—*"Ime maṁ, bhante .....bhikkhū amūlikāya sīlavipattiyā anuddhaṁsenti, sohaṁ bhante, sativepullappatto saṅghaṁ sativinayaṁ yācāmī'ti"*. The acquittal is granted in the usual *ñatti*-form.

Five conditions, *viz*., (i) the monk concerned must be innocent, (ii) he must have been censured, (iii) he must have requested the Saṅgha for acquittal, (iv) the Saṅgha must be prepared to grant it and (v) the Saṅgha must be duly constituted, are required to make the grant of acquittal lawful.

(*iii*) *Amuḷhavinaya*[3] :—This form is observed in case of offences committed during insanity. As in case of *Sativinaya* so also in it, the guilty monk appears before the Saṅgha, confesses his past insanity and the offences committed during that period. The grant of acquittal is deemed valid, if he confesses that he cannot remember the offence due to loss of his memory, or he remembers it as if committed in dream, or that he is still insane.

(*iv*) *Paṭiññātakaraṇa*[4] :—The proceeding of formal confession of an offence incurred by a monk in the presence of a monk senior to him or of a duly formed Saṅgha is adopted in case of a slight offence (*lahuka-āpatti*). This proceeding of *Paṭiññātakaraṇa* is distinguished from those adopted in case of other trials, for, in most cases, it comes, to a termination before reaching the *ñatti* stage. It is however carried out to the *ñatti* stage, if the person concerned does not confess his offence before a monk or a number of monks. In either case the grant of absolution is an individual concern.[1]

---

[1] *EBM*, pp. 157-58.

[2] *CV*, 4.2.5-11, pp. 153-59; 4.9.52, pp. 184-85.

[3] Ibid, 4.3.12-15, pp. 159-62; 4.9.53, pp. 184-86.

[4] Ibid, 4.4.16-17, pp. 162-64; 4.9.55, pp. 188-89.

(*v*) *Yebhuyyasikā*[2] :—When the local Saṅgha[3] and the *Ubbāhikā*[4] fail to settle the disputed matter, the decision is arrived at by the vote of the majority. The votes are taken by means of marked *salākas* (sticks) which are distributed by an officer known as *Salākaggahāpaka*, a person duly appointed by the Saṅgha. *Salākaggahāpaka* is free to apply any one of the three methods of taking vote, namely, the *Guḷhaka*, i.e. the secret-method, the *Sakaṇṇajappaka*, i e. the whispering method and the *Vivaṭaka*, i.e. the open method. If he apprehends *Adhammavādī* monks to be in majority, he adopts either of the first two methods. If not, then he takes recourse to the third. Not only this, he can even nullify the verdict of the majority, if he deems it against the *Dhamma*. Decidedly the *Salākaggahāpaka* holds a responsible position.[5]

(*vi*) *Tassapāpiyyasikā*[6] :—This method is adopted in case of a guilty monk who when examined for his offences makes evasive statements.[7] Thus in his effort to clear himself from the charge, he commits a fresh offence[8] which enables the Saṅgha to carry out the proceeding.[9] Accordingly, the guilty monk is first rebuked for, and then, is reminded for his offence. Finally after charging him with an offence, a befitting penalty is imposed on him by the usual *ñatti* form.

---

[1] Cf. *CV*, 4.9.55, p. 190 where the mover of *ñatti* declares-yadi saṅghassa pattakallaṁ, ahaṁ itthanāmassa bhikkhuno āpatti paṭigāheyyaṁti'; also *EBM*, p. 159.

[2] *CV*, 4.5.18-20, p. 164; 4.9.44, p. 177; 4.9.50-51, pp. 182-84.

[3] Ibid, 4.5.18, p. 164.

[4] Ibid, 4.9.50, p. 182

[5] Vide *Samantapāsādikā*, *sub voce; EBM*, pp. 159-61; *MV* (Roman), p. 351 for details as regards the method of taking votes.

[6] *CV*, 4.6.21-27, pp. 165-67; 4.9.54, pp. 187-88.

[7] avajānitvā paṭijānāti, paṭijānitvā avajānāti, aññenāññaṁ paṭicarati, sampajānamusā bhanati, *CV*, 4.6.21, p. 165.

[8] *MN*, Vol. II, p. 249.

[9] Perhaps the accused is taken to task for the offence committed during the trial, i.e., for his prevaricating statements, not for the offence committed before the trial. Dr. S. Dutt remarks-"After the commission of the offence as above, the usual *ñatti* was proposed and the *bhikkhu* sentenced accordingly". He again opines that in case of *Tassapāpiyyasika* "the offence arises in course of the trial". *EBM*, p. 162.

(*vii*) *Tiṇavatthārakā*[1] :—This form is applied in a case which when discussed is feared to give undesirable consequences. Therefore, it is deemed good to drop the issue as it is necessary to cover the filth by grass in order to get rid of its bad smell. Other requisite conditions for the trial are as usual.

These were the laws of polity which were carried out in the early Buddhist Saṅgha. Now we come to the Jaina.

(B) Jaina

The Jaina Church on account of its being an autocratic form of organisation depended entirely on the *Śāstā*, i.e., the Master, which was, of course, a custom in the 6th century B. C. It was therefore befitting that it equipped the officer or rather the officers of the Church with unlimited power and authority so that they could deal with the guilty persons properly, could settle the cases of disputes and quarrels successfully, and so on and so forth. A few words about the same will not be out of place here.

The offences and transgressions to be committed by a Jaina monk were innumerable and of varied nature. So also the punishments and expiations prescribed for the same. The judicial proceedings carried out against a transgressor was called '*Vavahāra*'. It was based either on the canon (*āgama*), or tradition (*sue*), or law (*āṇā*), or charge (*dhāraṇā*), or custom (*jie*).[2] The punishments and expiations together called *Prāyaścittas* to be inflicted on a guilty monk which were guided by this fivefold principles were ten,[3] the lightest being *Āloyaṇā* and the gravest *Pārañciya* :

1. Āloyaṇā —Condemnation,
2. Paḍikkamaṇa – Confession,
3. Tadubhaya —Confession and condemnation,
4. Vivega —Discrimination,
5. Viūsagga —Corpoal punishments,
6. Tava —Penance,
7. Cheya —Curtailment of seniority,
8. Mūla —Re-consecration,
9. Aṇavaṭṭhappā —Suspension,
10. Pārañciya —Expulsion.

---

[1] *CV*, 4.7 28-30, pp. 167-70; 4.9.55-60, pp. 188-92; *EMB*, pp. 309-10.

[2] *Vav*, 10.2.

[3] *Ṭhāṇ*, 489, p. 355b; 733, p. 484a; *Bhag*, p. 920ff; *Aup*. 78.

As these groups of *Prāyaścittas* form the subject matter of the following section, here we must confine to some important and relevant observations only. Absolution from the first six types of offences was sought either by confession or by self-imposed penance. The confession as well as the penance was practised before the *gurū* who gave necessary directions in this respect.[1] The punishment prescribed for the first of the last four *Prāyaścittas* was curtailment "of a part of the monk's ecclesiastical rank among his brethren, which dates from his second reception, the definitive consecration to the vow."[2] The minimum cut enforced was five days which was determined by the status of the guilty person in the Church hierarchy.[3] Besides, the loss (*Cheda*) was also determined, like the period of *Samodhānaparivāsa* of the Buddhists, by the period during which the offences were repeated. It was called *Santarā Gheda*.

The next, that is *Parihāra*, the purification of the transgressor by isolation lasted for one month, or for four months[4] or for six months[5]. The person undergoing the penalty was subjected more or less to social boycott.[6] It may roughly be compared with th *Parivāsa* of the Buddhists.[7]

The complete loss of the ecclesiastical rank is termed *Mūla*. The person *sub poena* is required to get himself re-admitted in the order (*punarvratopasthāpana*).[8] After the complete loss of the ecclesiastical rank, the transgressor is suspended from the ecclesiastical rights and privileges and placed on probation so that he may qualify himseif for re-admission.[9] This probationary period is known as *Aṇavaṭṭhappā* which seems partially identical to *Parivāsa* prescribed for heretics by the Buddhists.[10] Commission of a grave offence led to expulsion (*Pārañciya*\ from the Order for ever.

Other measures taken by the later Jainas were that they imposed upon the transgressor expiatory fasts whose duration varied according to the gravity of the offences. These fasts were divided into nine groups as below[1]:

---

[1] *Ṭhān*, p. 484a.

[2] *Indian Antiquary*, 39, p. 262, fn. 25; Comm. to *Aup*, p. 78.

[3] *Vav*, *Uddesaka* I; *Jīyakappa*, 80-82; *HJM*, pp. 235f; Appendix I.

[4] *Vav*, *Uddesaka* I; *HJM*, pp. 236, Appendix I.

[5] *Vav*, *Uddesaka I*.

[6] *Vav*, 2.28-30.

[7] Vide *Infra*, pp. 232-34.

[8] Comm. to *Aup*. p. 78; *Jīyakappa*, 83-86.

[9] *HJM*, p. 237.

[10] Vide *Supra*, pp. 95-6.

Name of the punishments	*Duration*	*Nature of the fast*
(1) Guruo	1 month	Aṭṭhameṇa
(2) Gurugatarāo	4 months	Dasameṇa
(3) Ahāguruo	6 months	Duvālasameṇa
(4) Lahuo	30 days	Chaṭṭheṇa
(5) Lahutarāo	25 days	Caūṭṭheṇa
(6) Ahalahuo	20 days	Āyaṁbileṇa.
(7) Lahusao	15 days	Egaṭṭhameṇa
(8) Lahusatarāo	10 days	Purimaḍḍheṇa
(9) Ahālahusao	5 days	Nivvīeṇa

(C) Conclusion

Both the Orders have a galaxy of punishments and expiations. When punishing the transgressor, the Buddhist as well as the Jaina Order, in various cases, gave the transgressor an opportunity to refute the charges levelled against him as well as a choice to choose the punishment for himself. Apart from this, both the Orders relied more on the transgressor than on the person reporting the offence. The faith put in Bhikkhu Dabba who had been accused by Bhikkhunī Mettiyā is a burning example in point.[2] It was because of the reason that the trial was guided by truth (*saccapainnā vavahārā*)[3] rather than by power and law.

(D) Problem of Senioriiy and Succession

Problem of seniority and succession is one of the most significant problems that come before an organisation of whatever nature it may be. The Buddhist or the Jaina Church was not an exception. Even in the lifetime of Lord Buddha the problem arose with regard to individual preferences provided by the Saṅgha. The Jaina Order too considered the problem of prime importance.

The main qualifications of the officers of the Buddhist Order were moral integrity, the knowledge of the Dhamma and the Vinaya and their proper and regular practice. It is evidenced by the rules framed for the guidance of the Saṅgha that only a learned and competent monk who has completed ten years or more may confer *Upasampadā* and give *nissaya*,[1] and can also ordain two novices or as many novices as he is able to admonish and instruct to,[2] and that even a monk of less standing is to be authorised instantly to recite the *Pātimokkha*, if all the *theras* of an *āvāsa* be ignorant.[3]

---

[1] *Cūrṇi* to *BṛhkB*, *Uddesaka* 5; *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 39, p, 267, fn. 45; *HJM*, p. 375.

[2] *CV*, 4 2.5-11, pp. 153-59.

[3] *Vav*, 4.11-12.

Similar was the case with the Jaina Order. Anybody willing to be posted to an office must possess, besides the requisite *pariyāya* the essential qualifications prescribed for the post. To serve as an illustration, the case of *Āyariyauvajjhāya* may be taken. The condidate for this post despite his seniority was asked to re-learn the *Ayārapakappa*, if he had forgotten the texts.[4] Even younger monks were intrusted with the duty of teaching older monks.[5] Thus we notice that regulations were laid down to encourage the younger monks and to avoid filthy competition.

It was essential to maintain law and order for the smooth running of the Fraternity, for harmonious relation among the members of the Saṅgha might have been at stake, if favouritism and nepotism would have gained ground in monastic life. The result might have been a constant conflict and finally a dissension in the Church which the Buddha was not prepared to welcome even at the cost of his own life. It never implies that the Buddha underrated seniority in age altogether. His estimation of age indeed was very high which has been well-established by the parable of *Tittirajātaka*.[6]

Of course, the Jaina Order attached more importance to experience *(pariyāya)* and scholarship than to age.[7] Despite the fact, the Jainas, like the Buddhists, could not overlook the importance of age completely. As such the Jaina Order ordained the *Āyariyauvajjhāya* to postpone the confirmation of a younger novice, if an older one was expected to complete his lesson by that time. If however he deliberately confirmed the younger person earlier than the older, he had to undergo *Cheda* or *Parihāra*.[8]

In framing the rules, both the Buddhists and the Jainas seem to have shown the keenest foresight and a peculiar psychological approach

---

1. *MV*, 1.26.82, p. 67.
2. Ibid, 1.46.105, p. 87.
3. Ibid, 2.16.24, pp. 117-18.
4. *Vav*, 3.10.
5. Ibid, 5.17-18.
6. *CV*, 6.4.18, pp. 256-57.
7. *Vav*, 4.13-14.
8. Ibid, 415.

to human nature. Consequently, they appear to be conscious enough of giving the least opportunity that may cause dissension in the Order at any time to come. One of the causes of cessation of the *nissaya*, for example, may be cited in case of the Buddhists. The *nissaya*, ceases towards the *Ācariya*, if the *Ācariya* and the *Upajjhāya* of a monk under dependence have come together.[1] It distinctly installed the latter at a level higher than the former. So also a Jaina monk of less standing (*seha*) having a following of disciples is required to remain under the control of a monk of greater standing (*rāinia*) having no disciples with him, if they have come together. In case both of them have disciples, then the disciples of the junior monk are not obliged to accept the authority of the monk having greater *pariyāya*.[2]

Moreover, the Buddhist as well as the Jaina Order gave due consideration to circumstances beyond one's control. For instance, if a supervisor of the construction of new buildings (*Navakammika*) after taking the charge of the construction became incompetent in any way and he accepted his incompetency, the office and its privileges were still his.[3] In the same way the Jaina Order asked a monk who had forgotten the texts due to old age or illness to re-learn the texts in order to appoint or re-appoint him to the post of a *Gaṇāvaccheiya*.[4]

We should not forget that the framer or rather the framers of the monastic laws after all were human beings, and as such they were in the know of the human short-comings and lapses. Therefore their best effort seems to be to accommodate all such short-comings and lapses without defying the rules of decorum and decency. The Buddhist law that if an *Ācariya* or an *Upajjhāya*, as the case may be, commits some grave offence then he should not be denied the right to hold that office instantly, illustrates it Instead, he should be given due opportunity to undergo the penance or atone for the offence imposed upon him by the Order. Moreover, his pupil must strive in order that the Saṅgha may revoke its sentence and restore him to the office[5] The Jainas as well seem to have promulgated a similar rule. For example, even a monk whose seniority has been cut short due to some offence committed by him is given an opportunity to act as *Āyariyauvajjhāya*. It solely depends on him to prove himself

---

1. *MV*, 1.27.83, p. 67.
2. *Vav*, 4.24-25.
3. *CV*, 6.11.30, pp. 268-71.
4. *Vav*, 5.17-18.
5. *MV*, 1.18.66, pp. 46-47; 1.23.78, pp. 61-62; *CV*, 8.11.21, pp. 331; 8.13.25, pp. 339-40.

worthy of the post by gaining confidence of monks under him by his good conduct.[1]

One peculiar feature of the Jaina Church is that the *Āyariya* can appoint his successor, if he is seriously ill or he is to disrobe himself. At the same time the monks forming his group are allowed to disagree with his decision and compel the new *Āayriya* to leave the office, if his choice is prejudiced in any way. The new *Āyariya* must surrender to the decision of the Saṅgha, otherwise he may incur *Cheda* or *Parihāra.*[2]

Now it will not be improper to say that individual as well as society has been given a balanced importance in the constitution of the Buddhists as well as the Jainas. The only motive behind it which can be summed up in a sentence was to install every person in a place worty of him in order to make him contented and righteous. Thus the organisers "who were conscious of such problem, made such rules as were fit to blend together the ideals of respects for age and respect for scholarship and moral conduct as well."[3]

---

1. *Vav*, 3.9-10.
2 Ibid, 4.13-14.
3. *Jaina Monastic Jurisprudence*, p. 30.

SECTION III

THE BUDDHIST PRĀTIMOKṢA & THE JAINA PRĀYAŚCITTA : A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Having noted down the main points of convergence and divergence of the Buddhist and the Jaina monastic administration, we now pass on to a prominent feature of monastic life, *viz.*, transgressions and expiations, designated as rules of the *Prātimokṣa* by the Buddhists and laws of *Prāyaścitta* by the the Jainas. It may be borne in mind that their significant characteristics lie in the fact that they deal with the daily affairs of the Fraternity and as such we would be failing in our duty to put forward a coherent picture of the Buddhist and the Jaina monastic life, if we overlook this aspect of the Church affairs.

First we must thank the framer or rather the framers of the Buddhist laws as they not only put forward two separate lists of transgressions and expiations, one for the monks (*Bhikkhupātimokkha*) and the other for the nuns (*Bhikkhunīpātimokkha*) classified in descending order of their gravity, but also state the circumstances which led to their formulation. The *Pārājika* being the gravest and the *Sekhiyā* the lightest, these groups *ut infra* contain altogether 227 rules for monks and 311 for nuns.

Groups of offences		*No. of offences Bhikkhu PM*	*No. of offences Bhikkhunī PM*
1. Pārājika	Expulsion	4	8
2. Saṅghādisesa[1]	Suspension	13	17
3. Aniyatā[2]	Indeterminates	2	×
4. Nissaggiyā-Pācittiyā	Forfeiture	30	30
5. Pācittiyā	Expiation	92	166
6. Pāṭidesaniyā	Confession	4	8
7. Sekhiyā	Rules of training	75	75
8. Adhikaraṇa-samathā	Ways of settling disputes	7	7
		227	311

---

[1] The offences comprising the *Pārājika* and the *Saṅghādisesa* groups collectively are called *Duṭṭhalla*.

[2] The *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha*, like the *Bhikkhupātimokkha*, contains all the sections but *Aniyatā*.

Some of the aforesaid groups, for one reason or the other, seem unjustifiably included in the *Prātimokṣa*. For instance, the restraints belonging to the seventh group, i. e., *Sekhiyā* can never come in the category of offences as neither of the follies is retributed with any punishment or expiation. As such Dr. Pachow aptly remarks that the violation of any of them by a Bhikkhu is not considered to be a criminal act but simply bad manners.[1]

Similarly, the offences enlisted in the third group ought not to be treated as a separate group for they belong, according to the circumstances, to *Pārājika*, *Saṅghādisesa* or *Pācittiyā* section. Likewise, the last section, the *Adhikaraṇasamathā* gives different methods for the settlement of a disputed issue of the Order. Now what we may infer is that out of the eight divisions, only five, namely, *Pārājika, Saṅghadisesa, Nissaggiyā Pācittiyā, Pācittiyā* and *Pāṭidesaniyā* are separate groups of what is called transgressions and expiations in the proper sense of the term.

Like the Buddhist, the Jaina Canon, too, refers to a number of offences and transgressions likely to be committed by the monks and nuns in various walks of monastic life. Moreover, they are also retributed with suitable punishments and expiations grouped in ten sections in ascending order of their seriousness, *Āloyaṇā* being the lowest and *Pārañciya* the highest. This classification often referred to in the Canonical texts[2] of the Śvetāmbara sect is as the following :

1. Āloyaṇā —Condemnation,
2. Paḍikkamaṇa —Confession,
3. Tadubhaya —Confession and condemnation,
4. Vivega —Discrimination,
5. Viusagga —Bodily punishments,
6. Tava —Penance,
7. Cheya —Curtailment of seniority,
8. Mūla —Re-consecration,
9. Aṇavaṭṭhappā —Suspension, and
10. Pārañciya —Expulsion.

It may be pointed out that the texts stating the above groups do not contain, like that of the Buddhist *Prātimokṣa*, a list of the exact number of offences, the groups consist of. For such a list we have to rely on several other texts like *Vyavahāra*, *Niśītha* and *Bṛhatkalpa*, etc. along with their exegetical literature. It may also be noted that the

---

[1] *A Comparative Study of Pātimokkha*, p. 49; Vide also *EBJ*, pp. 93-94.

[2] *Ṭhāṇ*, 489, p. 355b; 733, p. 484a; *Bhag*, pp. 920ff; *Aup*, p. 78.

Digambara texts[1] refer to the same list with the only difference that the ninth is termed as *Parihāra* and the tenth as *Saddhāna*.

The inclusion of some of the groups of offences in the list of the *Prāyaścitta*, as in case of the Buddhists already noted, seem to be unjustified. The fourth group, i. e., *Vivega* which is explained by the commentator as '*aśuddhabhaktādivivecanaṁ*' or 'discrimination between pure and impure food, etc.',[2] is practically an attempt to escape transgressions pertaining to food, etc., and as such in no case a commission of the transgression itself. Similarly *Viusagga* and *Tava*, the fifth and the sixth groups are, more or less, self-imposed asceticism, one of the essential virtues of a Jaina monk, and not an atonement for some offence. The rest of the groups, in fact, are the lists of offences and expiations proper.

Before we proceed to a detailed comparative study, we may equate, for the sake of convenience, some of the groups of the *Prātimokṣa* with that of the *Prāyaścittas* as under :

Buddhist	*Jaina*
Pārājika	Pārañciya
Saṅghādisesa	Aṇavaṭṭhappā
Pācittiyā &	Paḍikkamaṇa &
Pāṭidesaniyā	Āloyaṇā
Sekhiyā	Vivega

The reason for doing so is very obvious. We see that the punishment prescribed by both the Orders for the most heinous crimes is the same, i. e., expulsion from the Order (*Pārājika/Pārañciya*), and for offences a bit less serious is suspension (*Saṅghādisesa/Aṇavaṭṭhappā*). Confession and condemnation of a transgression committed is a common feature of the two Orders. Further, both the Orders seem to have framed a code of conduct which is sure to keep the monks away from the transgression, if they follow it properly.

Though the groups equated above are not entirely analogous, still they bear ample similarities which attest to their interaction and common source of origin.

The first section of the Buddhist *Prātimokṣa*, the *Pārājika* or the offences that defeat the transgressor, make him unfit for monk life—'*pārājiko hoti asaṁvāso*', are the most grievous as the only punishment for any one of them is expulsion. They are, in all, eight. The first four which pertain to sexual intercourse, theft, killing (*manussaviggaha*) and exaggeration of one's superhuman attainments (*uttarimanussadhamma*) are binding on monks and nuns alike. The rest which are meant exclusively for the nuns deal with their conduct showing sexual desire, suppression of fault and siding with a suspended monk.[1]

---

[1] *Mūl*, 5.165.

[2] Comm. to *Aup*, p. 78; *Pāiasaddamahaṇṇavo*, (p. 1001) also understands it as '*parityāga*' (giving up of transgression ?) *HJM* p. 153, fn. 65.

Its Jaina counterpart, as we have already pointed out, is known as *Pārañciya* or *Saḍḍhāna* (*Sraddhāna*), offences which entail expulsion from the Order[2]—'*liṅgādibhedaṁ*'. Though it is difficult to give the exact number of offences coming under this category, yet at least this much is certain that they when scrutinized seem to have been based on the same principles as the first three *Pārājikas* of the Buddhists. Our statement is attested by the fact that the violation of any of the *Mūlavratas* involves expulsion from the Order.[3] The *Sthānāṅgasūtra* refers to two sets of *Pārañciya* offences, each consisting of three; the former set accruing from *hatthakamma* (masterbation), *mehuṇa* (sexual indulgence) and *rāibhoyaṇa* (night-meal), and the latter[4] from *duṭṭha* (immoral acts), *pamatta* (being negligent) and *aṇṇamaṇṇaṁ-karemāṇe* (practising homosexuality).[5] Moreover, the Jaina list of the *Pārañciya* offences appears to be more comprehensive and severe than that of the Buddhist, because it includes some offences towards which the Buddhists seem to have taken a lenient attitude. For instance, disrespect to the *Ācārya* or any other officer of the Church, intimacy with a nun or a queen and murder of a king (together known as *duṭṭhapārañciya*)[6]; homosexuality (*aṇṇamaṇṇaṁ-karemāṇe*);[7] violation of the rules regarding food and drink and the like[8] are treated as severely as the offence of actual sex experience and hence their inclusion in the *Pārañciya* group.

Whether the Jaina Order treated a monk exaggerating his superhuman powers or making use of it with the same severity or not is

---

1. *PM* (*Bhikkhu* & *Bhikkhunī*) Ist Section.
2. '*Samukkasana*' & '*Nijjuhana*' are also the terms connected with the expulsion of a monk. But they are entirely different from the *Pārañciya*, the expulsion of a person from the Order due to some offence. *Samukkasana* and *Nijjuhana*, on the other hand, stand for the expulsion of a person holding an office, if he loses the confidence of his group (*Gaṇa*) and the omission of a person from a particular *Gaṇa* respectively. Cf. *Vav*, 2.6-17; *Jaina Monastic Jurisprudence*, p. 45.
3. Comm. to *Angd.*, 7. 57.
4. Comm. to *Ṭhān* pp. 162b-164b.
5. *Ṭhān*, 201, p. 162b.
6. Comm. to *Angd*, 7.57.
7. *Bṛhk*, 4.2.
8. *Aṅgd*, 7.57.

difficult to assert. However this much is certain that the monks were debarred from making a performance of it.[1]

For the verbal similarity of the *Prātimokṣa* text of the first two *Pārājikas* as exposed in the *Pārājika* volume of the *Vinayapiṭaka* with the Jaina Scriptural texts on the subject, one may refer to the *Niśīthasūtra*, *Uddesakas* I. 1-9, II, VII & VIII, and the *Bhagavatīsūtra*, IV. 1-2, etc.

The offences a bit less serious than the *Pārājika* are included in the second section, the *Saṅghādisesa* which are requited with temporary expulsion from the Order. These offences mainly pertaining to monk's or nun's leaning towards sexual indulgence, the trouble caused to a monk, a nun, or a householder by a groundless charge; an attempt to cause schism in a united assembly; the carrying out of ecclesiastical acts according to one's own sweet will; the contamination of a family by a monk; the lax morality of a nun; the concealment of faults; the acquisition of food by a passionate nun with her own hand from a passionate person or causing others to do so and the repudiation of the three jewels, i. e., the Buddha, the Dhamma and the Saṅgha; etc., are thirteen[2] for monks and seventeen[3] for nuns.

The punishments accruing from the above transgressions were *Parivāsa, Mānatta* and *Mūla* The first two were inflicted together in case the transgressor did not confess his guilt. If he admitted, then only *Mānatta* was imposed. The broad distinction between *Parivāsa* and *Mānatta* was that the former was inflicted for an unlimited period while the latter for a limited period of six days only. The person undergoing the expiation was denied association with his friend and also the right to participate in *saṅgha-kammas* during the expiatory period. If the person *sub poena*, before the completion of the expiation for the previous offence, committed another offence, then he was sent to the beginning of the punishment prescribed for the previous offence. It was termed *Mūla*.[4]

The complete set of punishments was called *Saṅghādisesa*, because a formal meeting of the assembly was required both at the time of imposition and withdrawal of the punishments—'*saṅgho ādimhi ceva sese ca icchitabbo assā ti saṅghādiseso*'.[5]

---

[1] *Suyg* (*SBE*. Vol, XLV), pp. 266-67; *Uttar*, 8.13; 15.7-8; 17.18; 20-45.

[2] *PM*, 2nd section: *EMB*, pp. 305-306.

[3] *PM* (*Bhikkhunī*), 2nd section; *EMB*, pp 310-11.

[4] *Pārājika*, 2.1.4, p. 152; etc.; *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*, p. 35; *EMB*, pp. 303-4.

[5] *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*, p 35.

Aṇavaṭṭhappā or *Parihāra* is the group of offences corresponding to the Buddhist *Saṅghādisesa*. According to the Canonical texts, it is often inflicted in three cases, *viz.*, on stealing something belonging to co religionist (*sāhammiyāṇaṁ*) or to a heretic (*aṇṇadhammiyāṇaṁ*) or on slapping (*hatthatālaṁ*) somebody else.[1] Besides, as the Bhāṣyas inform us, loosing understanding because of the desire to see a nun,[2] begging ten times a day,[3] taking a fruit belonging to a person in royal service even if allowed by him,[4] travelling with a nun at day[5] and the like are also castigated with the same punishment.

The *Parihāra* or *Parihāraviśuddhi*,[6] i.e., "the purification of the transgressor by means of penance in isolation, segregated from other members of the group" is, according to the commentator, twofold, namely, *gaṇapratibaddha* and *apratibaddha*, i.e., the transgressions committed by a monk while living corporate life in a *Gaṇa* and when living alone in a region foreign to him.[7] The period of expiation during which the transgressor who has lost his *pariyāya* completely is allowed to make himself eligible for re-admission to the Order, lasts for one, four or six months.[8] During this period, the transgressor has to undertake fast of various magnitudes which are adjusted according to the seasons. As for example, the maximum number of fasts that the person undergoing the penalty can undertake is upto the eighth, tenth and twelfth meal during the summer, winter and rainy seasons respectively, the minimum being upto the fourth, sixth and eighth meal.[9] It is however worth noticing that while the *Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya*[10] exempts the nuns from undergoing *Parihāra*, the *Vyavahārasūtra*[11] prescribes for them as well.

We need not worry if the offences of the group do not agree entirely with that of the Buddhists. It is however remarkable that in spite of this discordance, the punishments prescribed for the offences *sub judice* are more or less identical. A transgressor, to whatever

---

1. *Ṭhān*, 201, p. 162b; *Bṛhk* 4.3.
2. *BṛhkB*, Vol. III, 2258-62.
3. Ibid, Vol. II, 1697-1700.
4. Ibid, Vol I, 532ff; Vol. II, 906; Vol. 5089.
5. Ibid, Vol. II, 886-88.
6. *Ṭhān*, 206, p. 167b; Comm. pp. 168ab; *Bhag*, 320, p. 348b; etc.
7. *Mūl*, 5.165; Comm. Pt. 1, p. 290.
8. *Vav*, *Uddesaka*-1.
9. Comm. to *Ṭhān*, pp. 168ab; Comm, to *Bhag*, pp. 351-352.
10. *Op cit* , Vol. V, p. 1561.
11. *Op cit.*, 5.11-12; *Bṛhk*, 1.38.

Order he may belong, is isolated from his group for a certain period and is to undergo a rigorous course of discipline so that he may purify himself of the offence. This punishment we have just seen is called *Parivāsa* by the Buddhists and *Parihāra* by the Jainas. The most astonishing aspect of this punishment is that one of the three periods of *Parihāra* is identical with that of the Buddhist *Parivāsa* imposed upon a heretic before his entry into the Order. This similarity, even though partial, is significant. Moreover, this similarity constrains us to infer that the *Parihāra* or the *Parihāraviśuddhi* is not a synonym of *Aṇavaṭṭhappā* offences in the same way as the *Parivāsa* or the *Mānatta* (is the punishment for the *Saṅghādisesa* offence) is not a synonym of the *Saṅghādisesa*. In other words, *Parihāra* is to *Aṇavaṭṭhappā*, what *Parivāsa* is to *Saṅghādisesa*.

For the close similarities of the Jaina texts corresponding to the Buddhist *Saṅghādisesa* no. 1, one may refer to the *Vyavahārasūtra*, *Uddesaka*, 6 8-9; for *Saṅghādisesa* nos. 2 to 5, *Niśīthasūtra*, *Uddesakas*, 6, 7 & 8. as well as the *Daśāśrutaskandha*, 2. 1-2 ; for *Saṅghādisesa* no. 8, the *Daśāśrutaskandha*, 1. 5-6 ; for *Saṅghādisesa* no. 10, the *Daśāśrutaskandha*, 1. 15-19.

The next groups of offences which find more or less their counterpart in the Jaina list of the *Prāyaścittas* are *Pācittiyā* and *Pāṭidesaniyā*. The offences included in the *Pācittiyā* section, ninety-two for monks and hundred and sixty-six for nuns, cover diverse aspects of monastic life and "are regarded not so serious and hence expiation from them is attained by simple confession before a monk or by self-imposition of *Parivāsa*".[1] Besides the general instruction regarding food, robes, bed, bath, and tour, etc., the rules binding on the monks prohibit them from lying, slandering, hurting small living beings, giving food to heretics, deprecating Buddha's teaching, ordaining disqualified persons, admonishing nuns unlawfully, appropriating communal gifts for personal use, causing discomfort to co-monks and associating with unordained women.

Besides the prohibitions identical to those of the monks, the nuns were asked not to develop intimacy with a monk or a householder ; to throw rubbish things over a wall, etc ; to enjoy dancing, singing or music ; to behave indecorously at the donor's house; to hold back the *kaṭhina* privileges; to share one couch or one covering-cloth; to do household work; to learn or teach low arts (*tiracchānavijjā*); to enter a monastery without asking for permission; to abuse a monk; or to disobey the rules of *Vassāvāsa*. Apart from these, they were disallowed the use of garlic, umbrella, sandals, vehicle and ornaments, etc.

---

[1] *PM*, 5th section; *EMB*, pp. 306-12.

The *Pāṭidesaniyā*, i. e, the section on remission of offences by formal confession, includes four restrictions for monks[1] and eight for nuns[2]. The rules intended for the monks prohibit them from partaking of food taken by their own hands or received by the intervention of a nun, while those for nuns forbid them from taking butter, oil, honey, molasses, fish, meat, milk and curds in normal condition.

It has already been observed that the atonement prescribed for the offences included in the *Pācittiyā* and the *Pāṭidesniyā* are, however, identical with those laid down for the *Paḍikkamaṇa* and the *Āloyaṇā*.[3] It is true that absolution from the latter two, i. e., *Paḍikkamaṇa* and *Āloyaṇā* like that of the former two groups of offences of the Buddhists is sought by simple confession. However we cannot deny the fact that the latter section, unlike the former are not appended with a detailed list of offences forming the sections. The simple reason for this emission is that they form the most important items of daily routine of a Jaina monk or a nun without any consideration of his or her status in the Church hierarchy. Whatever may be the reasons or circumstances for the commission of a transgression—mental, vocal or physical, the transgressor has not only to report it to his *Ācārya* or *Upādhyāya*, but also to confess and condemn it before him in the morning, if committed in the night or in the evening, if committed in the morning.[4] Hence the framers of the code, very likely did not deem it proper to harass the pious monks by appending to the list of the *Prāyaścittas* the offences forming the *Paḍikkamaṇa* and the *Āloyoṇā* groups.

In spite of the facts pointed out just before, we may bring together some of the offences belonging to the aforesaid groups from the day-to-day life of the monks. For instance, taking other's requisites without his permission, practising penance or going out without the permission of the *Ācārya*, back-biting, disobeying the *Ācārya*, migrating from one Order to another Order without informing its members and failing to perform the *Āvaśyakas* were simply confessed;[5] while touching the body of the *Ācārya*, a quarrel, transgression pertaining to study and service, becoming passionate when on begging-tours and causing discomfort to others[1] were confessed as well as condemned.

---

[1] *PM*, 6th section; *EMB*, p. 309.

[2] *PM*, (*Bhikkhunī*), 5th section; *EMB*, p. 312.

[3] *Mūl*, 2.56-58.

[4] Vide *Supra*, pp. 166-68, 222f.

[5] *Angd*, 7.38ff.

For the close similarities corresponding to the Buddhist *Pācittiyā* offences, one may compare *Nis*, 2.19; *Dasā*, 2.13, *Bṛhk*, 6.1 for *Pācittiyā* no. 1; *Nis*, 2.18; *Bṛhk*, 6.1 for *Pācittiyā* no. 2; *Dasā*, 1.10 for *Pācittiyā* no. 3; *Vav*, 10.18 for *Pācittiyā* no. 4; *Uttar*, 1.26 for nos. 5 & 7; *Dasā*, 1.7; *Dasv*, 10.2 for no. 10; *Dasā*, 1.7 for no. 11; *Bṛhk*, 3.15 for nos. 14-15; *Dasv*, 10.3 for no. 19; *Nis*, 4.23 for no. 23; *Nis*, 4,24 for no. 25; *Nis*, 8.11 for no. 27; *Nis*, 2.32-7 for no. 31; *Bṛhk*, 4.1; *Dasā*, 2.3 for no. 37; *Nis*, 8.16 for nos. 38-39; *Uttar*, 1.26 for nos. 44-45; *Bṛhk*, 3. 34-35 for nos. 48-50; *Nis*, 2. 21, *Dasā*, 2. 9, 19, *Dasā*, 6. 61-3 for no. 57; *Nis*, 14. 10-11 for no. 58; *Dasā*, 2. 12 for no. 61; *Dasv*, 10. 2 for no. 62; *Nis*, 4. 25-26; *Dasā*, 1. 12-13 for no. 63; *Vav*, 10, 16 for no 65; *Nis*, 11.9. for no. 72; *Bṛhk*, 4.3 for nos 74-75 and *Nis*, 5. 13 for nos. 89,91 & 92.

Now our next step would be to discuss the rules which do not agree with any section of the Jaina *Prāyaścitta*. They are the *Aniyatā*, the *Nissaggiyā Pācittiyā* and the *Adhikaraṇasamathā* The first section, that is, the *Aniyatā* contains only two offences which deal with the conduct of a monk with a woman.[2] These offences are so arranged and named *Aniyatā* (Indeterminates), i. e., 'to be decided' because the compiler himself, on account of the varying character of the punishment, could not decide as to which section it should actually belong. Thus it is apparent that its separate grouping is simply an augmentation to the sections of the *Prātimokṣa*.

Apparently the *Aniyatā* may be equated with the *Tadubhaya*, the third section of the Jaina *Prāyaścitta*. But at the same time it is also evident that the former differs widely from the latter, firstly, because the offences included in the former are more serious than those belonging to the latter, and secondly, the punishments laid down for the former ranges from *Pārājika* to *Pācittiyā* while those for the latter consist simply of confession and condemnation.[3] One may compare *Uttarādhyayana*, 1.26 for a regulation similar to the first *Aniyatā*.

Next to *Aniyatā* comes *Nissaggiyā ā Pcitiiya*. It contains equal number of restrictions for monks[1] as well as nuns[5], i.e , thirty. The atonement

---

1. *Angd*, pp. 503-504; *Mūl*, 7.114-33; *Ṭhān*, 538, p. 379b; *Uttar*, 26.2-4; 8.13; *OghN*, 633-37, pp. 199b-200a; *HJM*, pp. 180, 211, 348.
2. *PM*, 3rd section; *EMB*, p. 306.
3. tadubhayārhaṁ yadālocaṇāmithyāduṣkṛtābhyāṁ. Comm. to *Ṭhān*, p. 356b.
4. *PM*, 4rth section; *EMB*, p. 306.
5. *PM* (*Bhikkhunī*), 3rd section; *EMB*, p. 311.

prescribed for the offences of this section complies with that of the *Pācittiyā* and the *Pāṭidesaniyā* inasmuch as the confession and condemnation of the offences are concerned. But the most striking feature of the atonement which differentiates it from that of the *Pācittiyā* and the *Pāṭidesaniyā* is the forfeiture of the thing with respect to which the offence is committed.[1] This is the reason that most of the offences of the group are pertaining to the unlawful acquisition of things like robes, alms-bowl and such other things, which serves in turn as the basis of their sub-classification. The offences committed in respect of *Cīvara* (Robes) are, for example, grouped together and named after it as *Cīvaravaggo*, i. e., the Section on robes.

For regulation similar to the Buddhist *Nissaggiyā Pācittiyā* nos. 19, 20, 21 and 26 one should see the *Nisīthasūtra*, 5.12; 14.1; 14.3 and the *Vyavahārasūtra*, 8.15; etc.

The *Sekhiyās*, i.e., the rules of training, it has already been stated, are prescribed no penalty or atonement. A violation of the rules, therefore is regarded simply as indecent deportment. Such instructions are only seventy-five which set forth the way to enter into the houses of lay-devotees, the restrictions to be observed while taking food and after finishing it on the one hand, and forbid monks from going inside the sick-room with shoes on and imparting instructions to the laities under certain circumstances on the other.[2]

This section is roughly comparable to the Jaina *Vivega* which asks a monk to be cautious about the transgressions to be committed by impure food, etc.

For rules similar to the *Sekhiyās*, one may refer to *Bṛhk*, 3.22-23; *Dasv*, 5.2, 81 for nos. 3-26; *Suyg*, I. 9.21 for no. 26; *Dasā*, 1.15; 2.21 for no. 55; *Uttar*, 1.22 for nos. 64, 68, 69, 70; etc.

As the *Adhikaraṇasamathas* or the ways of settling disputed matters have already been duly discussed in the section just preceding, the readers are requested to refer to the aforesaid section and also to allow us to drop it here.

The last two sections, namely, *Sekhiyā* and *Adhikaraṇasamathā*, as is clear from the foregoing explanation, have nothing to do with the transgressions and punishments proper, still they are welded together with the other sections of the *Prātimokṣa.* The inclusion of the first in the *Prātimokṣa* may, however, be justified as the practice of the rules of training helps in evading the commission of transgressions, and that of the second only because it assists in the execution of the *Prātimokṣa* rules.

---

[1] *Pārājika*, 4.1.5, pp. 288-89.

[2] *PM*, 7th section; *EBM*, p. 307; The 6th section of the PM, (*Bhikkhunī*) contains 75 *Sekhiyā* rules for nuns which are identical with those of the monks.

Apart from the offences belonging to one or other group of the *Prātimokṣa,* we come across transgressions which are termed *Thullaccaya, Dukkaṭa* and *Dubbāsita.* Though it is not possible to classify them into categories still at least this much is certain that the transgressions falling in the *Thullaccaya* group are more serious than those belonging to the *Dukkaṭa.* As for example, performing *Uposatha* with an incomplete assembly without any bad design incur *Dukkaṭa,* whereas doing the same with a view to cause schism in an unified assembly brings on *Thullaccaya.*[1]

Now we come to the remaining groups of offences which are peculiarly Jaina. They are *Kausagga, Tava, Cheya* and *Mūla. Kausagga* or *Kāyotsarga* is a kind of meditation which is performed for certain *ucchvāsas* depending on the occasion on which it is performed.[2] It, like *Paḍikkamaṇa,* and *Āloyaṇā* is performed daily or more often also before taking food, after begging or after answering calls of nature, etc.[3] The practice of *Kāyotsarga* differs from that of *Paḍikkamaṇa* and the *Āloyaṇā* inasmuch as the former conduces control over the mind as well as on the body, whereas the latter two lead simply to mental purification. The *Tapa* seems to be no less important than the *Kāyotsarga* as it like *Kāyotsraga* regulates both mind and body.[4] In the words of Prof. L. Renou, *Kāyotsarga* and *Tapa* are "corpoal punishments, which resemble the voluntary practices of asceticism.[5]"

Another peculiar feature of the Jaina punishment is *Cheda* or shortening of *pariyāya* which is increased or decreased according to the status of the person in the Church hierarchy. In other words, the higher the status, the higher is the cut. For instance, the minimum cut enforced in case of an ordinary monk is five days (*pañcarāindiya cheya*), for the *Upādhyāya* ten days and that for the *Ācārya* is fifteen days.[1] The gradual increase in the shortening of *pariyāya* of the transgressor for repeating the same offence during the expiatory period is termed '*santarācheya*'.[2]

---

[1] Cf. *MV*, 2.30, 43, pp. 132-33; 2.31.44, pp. 133-34 with 2.32.45, pp. 134-37. At another place the monks siding with the schismatics (*bhedakānuvattakabhikkhū*) are also said to have incurred *Thullaccaya.* *CV*, 7.10.16, p. 302.

[2] *Mūl*, 7, 150-86; *HJM*, pp. 350-51; 460.

[3] *OghN*, 510-12, pp. 175a-175b.

[4] Vide *Supra*, pp. 36ff, 166.

[5] *Religions of Ancient India*, pp. 126-29.

One of the most striking features of the Jaina *Prāyaścitta* is that the Bhāṣyas and the Chūrṇis introduce an altogether new set of punishments based mainly on fasts of different magnitudes. A person begging food seven times a day is punished, for instance, with *Saḍgurū*, while a person begging six times a day is to undergo *Saḍlahu.*[3]

From the preceding comparison, it is manifest that the principle which served as the basis for the formulation of the transgressions and their corresponding punishments of both the Orders differed considerably. The Buddhists seem to have insisted mainly on mental purification, while the Jainas both on mental as well as physical. It was this fundamental difference in their objectives which enabled the Jainas to include corporal punishments in the list of the *Prāyścittas.* It was but indispensable for this is the point where Jainism is distinguished from Buddhism.

Besides this basic disagreement, the following points may also be regarded as obvious cases of difference :

(a) The Buddhist *Prātimokṣa* refers to a definite number of offences, whereas the offences referred to in the Jaina texts are innumerable and therefore, more comprehensive.

(b) All the offences of the Buddhist *Prātimokṣa* are grouped in seven categories as against the ten groups of the Jaina *Prāyaścittas.*

(c) Each and every rule of the Buddhist *Prātimokṣa* is preceded by an episode that led to its formulation. This aspect of the constitution of a rule is absolutely lacking in case of the Jainas.

(d) The *Prātimokṣa* rules are executed in the presence of a complete and lawful assembly of the fortnightly meeting. A person guilty of any offence pertaining to either of the seven categories of offences has to confess his offence publicly just after the recitation of the group concerned. The assembly after making a thorough investigation of the offence either punishes or exempts him or her of the offence as it deems proper.

---

1. *Bṛhk*, 5.5; *Vav*, 129-32, *Jiyakappa*, 80-82.
2. *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 39, p. 262, fn. 25.
3. *BṛhkB*, Vol. II, 1697-1700; for references to such expiations and punishments vide *BṛhkB*, Vol. I, 288-89, 471-529, 532ff, 694-5, 786; Vol. II, 906, 1456ff; Vol. IV, 3304, 3893-98; Vol. V, 5089, 5095; etc.; Comm. to *Angd*, 7.55.

Despite these differences, the points of agreement already adverted to are significant as well as revealing. The agreement of *Pārājika* with *Pārañciya*, that of *Saṅghādisesa* with *Aṇavaṭṭhappā*, that of *Parivāsa* with *Parihāra*, that of *Pāṭidesaniyā* with *Paḍikkamaṇa* and that of *Sekhiyā* with *Vivega* clearly show that though the two codes of transgressions and punishments differ in details, yet one thing that there was a fountain head from which, the cardinal groups of offences like *Pārājika* and *Saṅghādisesa* of the Buddhist *Prātimokṣa*, and *Pārañciya* and *Aṇavaṭṭhappā* of the Jaina *Prāyaścitta* drew their inspiration and source.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

Buddhism, like Jainism, was a movement of monastic asceticsism. No mendicants, not even the Brahmaṇical *yatis* and *munis* could stick so strictly to the ideals of their monastic life as the Buddhist and the Jaina monks and nuns. The Jaina ascetics whom we can still see in the western part of the country walking from place to place with moping looks and emaciated bodies surpassed in this respect even the Buddhists. As they started and flourished side by side in the same region of the land, and came in contact with the same important parsonalities of the time, like kings Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru, the mutual influence and interaction which have already been noted were natural. In the following paragraphs, therefore, we should restrict ourselves to some important findings only.

It has been observed that the Buddhist Order was out and out a republican organization. It was, of course, a deviation from the general trend of thought which, in the 6th century B. C., held that each *Saṅgha* or *Gaṇa* of mendicants must have an all-powerful leader. The Buddha, though he acted more or less as a leader of the Buddhist Order during his lifetime, did not appoint anybody, the leader of his Order.[1] Instead he strove to give the code of Vinaya that fullness and competency which might keep the Fraternity intact even after his passing away. This aspect of promulgation gave the laws of Vinaya a system and maturity which are absolutely lacking in the Jaina ascetic laws.

Another characteristic of promulgation of a Vinaya rule peculiar to the Buddhist is that it admits frankly what custom or usage it borrowed from others and what did it give up on account of their practice among the heretics. One may be referred to the introduction of *Uposatha* and *Vassāvāsa* as illustrations to the former and to the prohibition to use a bowl made either of gourd or human skull to the latter.[2] The latter way of the promulgation of a rule is indicative of the hostile feelings of the Budddhists sustained inadvertently against the contemporary religious sects and schools. This aspect of a rule is almost unknown to the Jainas.

---

[1] yo vo, Ānanda, mayā dhammo ca vinayo ca desito paññatto, so vo mamaccayena satthā *DN*. Vol. II, p.118.

[2] Vide *Supra*, pp. 160, 170, 119.

Besides the episode, concocted or real, appended as a background to the formation of a rule makes the laws of Vinaya forceful and convincing. Such circumstancial details of the formation of a monastic rule is unknown to the ancient Jainas. Later on the commentators however endeavoured to remove this lacuna and they succeeded in their efforts considerably.

It appears from the accounts of the *Vinayapiṭaka* that a number of rules were framed on account of public comment. It was herhaps due to the reason that not only the Buddhists but the monastic community as a whole depended solely on the laity for provisions and clothings. Moreover, the Buddha and his disciples were very much eager to popularize their religion. This motive of the Buddha has often found expression in the words—"*appasannānaṁ vā pasādāya pasannānaṁ vā bhiyyobhābāya*" (to convert the unconverted and to augment the number of those converted). This enforced them to give a patient hearing to the complaints, grievances and suggestions of the people, especially kings and ministers, and even to attach more importance to them than to their own men. This tendency is however absent in early Jaina accounts. The result was that the ascetics had to suffer a lot at the hands of the people. Sometimes they were thrown into water by boatman because they were of no help to them even in cases of dangers and difficulties.[1] Besides, the Jaina ascetics whose presence produced bad smell as they abstained from taking bath, etc., were also looked down upon by householders of clean habits.[2] With the lapse of time the Jaina monks however perceived this disadvantageous aspect of their regulations and they tried to amend them accordingly.

Now let us consider the factors which made Buddhism travel far and wide, while Jainism like Hinduism remained confined in the land of its origin. In this connection I would like to quote Prof. Conze. He remarks—"In Buddhism there is nothing which cannot easily be transported from one part of the world to another. It can adapt itself as easily to the snowy heights of the Himalayas as to the parched plains of India, to the tropical climate of Java, the moderate warmth of Japan and the bleak cold of outer Mongolia."[3] The position with Jainism is quite different. The strict monastic rules like the practice of nudity and vegetarianism of Jainism make it difficult to acclimatize especially in cold countries where people freeze into ice, if they give up clothings and starve to death, if they stick to vegetarian habits. Even

---

1. Vide *Supra*, p. 189.
2. *Āyār* (*SBE*. Vol. XXII), 2.2.2.1 (pp. 124-25).
3. Prof. Conze, *Buddhism*, p. 77.

in India it could survive and flourish in the dry regions of Rajasthan and Gujarat in the west and Mysore in the south only. It could not survive in Assam, Bengal, and Bihar where rains are abundant and vegetable growth profuse and dence.

Both the Buddhist and the Jaina codes of discipline bear obvious cases of borrowing and adoptation from the Brahmaṇical sources. For example, the five fundamental precepts of good conduct practised alike by the Buddhists and the Jainas derived, most probably, their inspiration and source from the Brahmaṇical code. The table given below will illustrate our viewpoint clearly :

Brahmaṇical[1]

1. Abstention from injuring living beings,
2. Truthfulness,
3. Abstention from appropriating the property of others,
4. Continence,
5. Liberality.

Buddhist

1. Not to destroy life[2],
2. Not to steal,
3. Not to commit adultery[3],
4. Not to tell lies[4],
5. Not to take intoxicating drinks[5].

Jaina

1. Not to destroy life,
2. Not to tell lies,
3. Not to appropriate what is not given,
4. Not to indulge in sexual intercourse,
5. Not to find interest in worldly possessions.

Besides, similar other instances where either the Buddhists or the Jainas borrowed or adopted from the Brahmaṇical code may also be spotted out. Such regulation as making a murderer of an arahata incompetent for entry to the Buddhist Church appears to be introduced on the instance of the heinous crime of murdering a Brahmin known as *mahāpātaka.* This is only one instance out of many.

---

[1] *Baudhāyana*, II. 10.18; *SBE*. Vol- XXII, Introduction, pp. xxii-iv.

[2] *The Laws of Manu* (*SBE*. Vol. XXV) p. 416; *The Sacred Laws of the Aryas*, (*SBE*. Vol. II), p. 188.

[3] *Viṣṇudharmasūtra* (*SBE*. Vol. VII), p. 136.

[4] *The Sacred Laws of the Aryas*, (*SBE*. Vol. II), p. 290.

[5] Ibid. pp. 63, 74, 188.

On the other hand there were some points on which both Buddhism and Jainism differed widely from Brahmaṇism. One of such issues was that of *Varṇāśramadharma* which ordains religious life after the lapse of a major portion of the early life. Buddhism and Jainism allow entrance into religious life at an early age because religion can be best cultivated when the sense organs are in order and good condition.[1] Thus they maintain the principle—'*śarīramādyaṁ khalu dharma sādhanam*', i. e., the human bodies indeed is the prime conition of spiritual cultivation.

The other point was the status of women in general and their competency in religious matters in particular. It has been noticed that the opinion which they held about women was not very high. The Jainas accepted the principle of—'*puruṣottariko dharmaḥ*', that is, in religious functions the male members are superior in all respects. This principle was universalised and cases of controversy were decided with its help. In the *Vyavahārasūtra* we find a peculiar case of proprietorship regarding the projeny of renegade monks and nuns. The litigation arose when a monk belonging to a particular group gave up his robes and married a renegade nun belonging to another group. It was decided on the basis of the above principle that the projeny of such couple should belong to the group to which the male member belonged. The principle was raised to the status of a supreme law in contradistinction from the principle known as 'Land and Seed', 'Concubine and Paramour' which support the female side in such litigations. This shows that the Jainas like others were not prepared to give equal position to nuns with monks under any circumstance. It is not known when this attitude towards woman originated in the history of our culture. If the Buddha's hesitation to admit woman is a historical fact, the attitude is at least as old as the time of the Buddha. The ancient Jaina tradition which believes in a woman Tīrthaṅkara proves that the original Jaina view was radically different. In a section of later Jainism even nunhood is denied to woman, not to speak of Tīrthaṅkarahood or Arhatahood. In the ancient Jaina Āgamas as well as in the Pāli Tipiṭaka instances of woman Arhatas are abundant, though Buddhahood is denied to woman in the Pāli Canon.

---

[1] jarā jāva na pīlei vāhī jāva na vaḍḍhai /
jāviṁdiyā na hāyaṁti tāva dhammaṁ samāyare // *Dasv*, 8. 36.

The position of women in the period of the Saṁhitas and also Brāhmaṇas was very high. They held almost co-equal status. There were many women *ṛṣis*, i e., seers of hymns. The wife was the mistress of the household and was respected by father and mother-in-laws. In the Upaniṣad we see Brahmavādinī women ascetics well-versed in Vedic lore. Husband and wife together performed a sacrifice. Even in the Sūtra period we find that there were women teachers. If we are to believe the tradition recorded in the *Hāritasaṁhitā*, women were also invested with sacred threads. In course of time women lost these privileges perhaps owing to the expansion of society and the growing needs of domestic life. Still the position of the mother and the wife was highly exalted. Her word was almost law. The Pāṇdava brothers had to marry Draupadī one after another at the mother's behest. In course of time women were deprived of education and early marriage was recommended. It is perhaps the influence of the ascetic orders, heretical and orthodox, that women came to be looked upon with suspicion. A male ascetic avoided the company of women for fear of losing chastity. It is a fact and the biological law that a woman has over-powering fascination over men specially in the time of puberty. Race preservation is a law of nature and asceticism is only a violent repudiation of it. Of course, chastity has got importance for higher spiritual life. But it is in the Brahmaṇical Smṛtis only that we find that householders occupy a central place in the society and they are the supporters of all orders including ascetics. It was believed that a man could not attain higher life in heaven unless he has produced sons.

Thus it is manifest that Brahmaṇism handled this issue differently. It adored women when it found them of some utility to men and disparaged them when it saw them coming in their way. Accordingly, Manu, one of the greatest law givers, while at one place remarks, '*yatra nāryastu pujyante ramante tatra devatāḥ*', opines at other, '*na strī svātantryamarhati*'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brahmaṇical

1 *Āpastamba* (*SBE*, Vol. II), Tr. by George Buhler, Oxford, 1879.

2 *Āruṇeyopaniṣad* Tr. by V. C. Seshachari, Madras, 1898-99.

3 *Baudhāyana* (*SBE*, Vol. XIV), Tr. by George Buhler, Oxford, 1882.

4 *Bhagavadgītā*, Ed. by V. Sharma, Bombay, 1909.

5 *Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra*.

6 *Manusmṛti* (*SBE*, Vol. XXV), Tr. by George Buhler, Oxford, 1886.

7 *Sarvasiddhānta Saṅgraha*, Ed. by Pt. Shri S. N. Sukla, Kashi.

8 *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, Ed. by S. Samasrami, Calcutta, 1900-10. Tr. by Eggling, Oxford, 1882-1900.

Buddhist

1 *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, 4 Volumes, Nava Nalanda Mahavihara, Nalanda, 1960.

The Book of Gradual Sayings, 5 Volumes, Tr. by F. L. Woodward & E. M. Hare, London, 1932 to 1936.

2 *Dīgha Nikāya*, 3 Volumes, Nava Nalanda Mahavihara, Nalanda, 1958.

Dialogues of the Buddha, 3 Volumes, Tr. by T. W. Rhys Davids & C. A. F. Rhys Davids, London, 1899, 1921, 1938.

3 *Khuddaka Nikāya*, 9 Volumes, Nava Nalanda Mahavihara, Nalanda, 1959 to 1960.

Psalms of the Early Buddhists (*Theragāthā*), Tr. by C.A.F. Rhys Davids, London, 1913.

Psalms of the Sisters (*Therīgāthā*), Tr. by C. A. F. Rhys Davids, London, 1909.

4 *Majjhima Nikāya*, 3 Volumes, Nava Nalanda Mahavihara, Nalanda, 1958.

The Middle Length Sayings, 3 Volumes, Tr. by I. B. Horner, London, 1954, 1957, 1959.

5 *Saṁyutta Nikāya*, 4 Volumes, Nava Nalanda Mahavihara, Nalanda, 1959.

The Book of Kindred Sayings, 5 Volumes, Tr. by Mrs. Rhys Davids & F. L. Woodward, London, 1917 to 1930.

6 *Vinayapiṭaka*, 5 Volumes, Nava Nalanda Mahavihara, Nalanda, 1956 to 1958.

Samantapāsādikā (Comm. on the *Vinayapiṭaka*)

Vinaya Texts (SBE, Vols. XIII, XVII, XX), Tr. by H. Oldenberg & T. W. Rhys Davids, Oxford, 1881 to 1885.

The Book of the Discipline, 5 Volumes, Tr. by I. B. Horner, London, 1940 to 1952.

Vinayapiṭaka, Tr. by Rahula Sankrityayana, Banaras, 1935.

7 *Pātimokkha*, Ed. by R. D. Vadekar, Poona, 1939.

Kaṅkhāvitaraṇi (Comm. on the *Pātimokkha*), Ed by D. M. Stede, London, 1956.

8 *Aṭṭhasālini* (Comm. on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*), Ed. by P. V. Bapat, Poona.

Expositor, Tr by C. F. Rhys Davids, London, 1931.

9 *Milindapañho*, Ed. by R. D. Vadekar, Bombay, 1940.

10 *Visuddhimagga*, Ed. by D. Kausambi, Bombay.

The Path of Purification, Tr. by Bhikkhu Nanmoli, Colombo, 1956.

Jaina (Śvetāmbara)

1 *Antagaḍadasāo*, Ed. by Dr. P. L. Vaidya, Poona, 1932.
Comm. by Abhayadeva, Ahmedabad, 1932.

2 *Aṇuttarovavāiyadasāo*, Ed. by P. L. Vaidya, Poona, 1932.
Comm. by Abhayadeva, Ahmedabad, 1932.

3 *Aṇuyogaddāra* with *Vṛtti* by Maladhari Hemachandra, Patan, 1939.

4 *Āvassayasuya* with *Bhāṣya* by Haribhadra, Agamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1916.

Comm. by Malayagiri, Agamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1928.

Niryukti by Bhadrabahu.

5 *Āyāraṅgasuya*, Comm. by Silanka, Surat, 1935.

Niryukti by Bhadrabahu.

SBE, Vol XXII, Tr. by H. Jacobi, 1884.

6 *Bhagavaīsuya*, Comm. by Abhayadeva, Agamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1931.

7 *Bṛhatkalpasūtra* with *Bhāṣya* by Sanghadasagani, Comm. Malayagiri and Ksemakirti, Atmananda Jaina Sabha, Bhavnagar, 1933-38.

Kalpa-Vyāvahāra-Niśītha Sūtra, Ahmedabad.
Tr. in *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. 39, pp. 257 ff.

8 *Dasāsuyakkhandha*, Bhavnagar, V. S. 2011.

9 *Dasaveyāliya*, Ed. by K. V. Abhyankar, Ahmedabad, 1938.

10 *Jīyakappa*, Ed. by Muni Punyavijaya, Ahmedabad, V. S. 1994.
Ed. by Muni Jinavijaya, Ahmedabad, V. S. 1983.

11 *Kappasutta* with Comm. '*Kalpalatā-Vyākhyā*' by Samayasundara, Surat.
Tr. by Jacobi (*SBE*, XXII), 1884.

12 *Mahānisīha*, Ed. by W. Schubring, Berlin, 1918.

13 *Nandi* with Comm. by Malayagiri, Bombay, 1924.
Hindi Comm. by Hastimalla Muni, Satara, 1942.

14 *Nāyādhammakahāo* with Comm. by Abhayadeva, Agamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1919.
Ed. by N. V. Vaidya, Poona, 1940.

15 *Niryāvaliyāo* with Comm. by Candrasuri, Ahmedabad, 1938.
Ed. by N. V. Vaidya, Poona.

16 *Nisīha* with *Bhāṣya*, Ed. by W. Schubring, Leipzing, 1918.

17 *Oghaṇijjutti* with *Bhāṣya* and Comm. by Droṇācārya, Bombay, 1919.

18 *Ovavāiya* with Comm. by Abhayadeva, Surat, V. S. 1994.

19 *Paiṇṇaya*, Bombay, 1927.

20 *Pañcavastukagrantha* of Haribhadra, Jaina Pustakoddhara Sanstha, Bombay, 1927.

21 *Piṇḍaṇijjutti* with *Bhāṣya* and Comm. by Malayagiri, Jaina Pustakoddhara Sanstha, Bombay, 1927.

22 *Pauṣadhaṣaṭatrinśikā*, Ed. by P. B Jhavery, Surat, 1933.

23 *Rāyapaseṇiya* with Comm. by Abhayadeva, Ahmedabad, V. S. 1994.

24 *Samvāyaṅga* with Comm. by Abhayadeva, Agamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1918.

25 *Sūyagaḍaṅga* with Comm. by Silanka, Agamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1917. Tr. by H. Jacobi, SBE. Vol. XLV, 1895.

26 *Ṭhāṇaṅga* with Comm. by Abhayadeva, Agamodaya Samiti, Bombay, 1918.

27 *Uttarājjhayaṇa* with Comm. by Nemicandra, Bombay, 1937.
Comm. by Santisuri, Bombay, 1916.
Ed. by J. Charpentier, Upsala, 1922.
Tr. by Jacobi (*SBE*, Vol. XLV) 1895.

28 *Uvāsagadasāo* with Comm. by Abhayadeva, Ed. by P. L. Vaidya, Poona, 1930.

29 *Vavahāra* with *Bhāṣya*.
Comm. by Malayagiri, Bhavnagar, 1926.
Ed. by Schubring, Leipzig, 1918.

30 *Vivāgasuya* with Comm. by Abhayadeva, Baroda, V. S. 1922.
Ed. by P. L. Vaidya, Poona, 1933.

31 *Viṁśativiṁśikā* of Haribhadra, Ed. by K. V. Abhyankar, Poona, 1932.

Jaina (Digambara)

32 *Anagāradharmāmṛta* of Ashadhara.
Comm. by Kumuda Chandra Manikachandra Digambara Jaina Granthamala, 1919.

33 *Ārādhanāsāra*, Manikachandra Digambara Jaina Granthamala, Bombay, V. S. 1973.

34 *Bhagavatī Ārādhanā* of Sivakoti, Devendrakirti Granthamala, Solapur, 1935.

35 *Bṛhatkathākośa* of Harisena, Ed. by Dr. A. N. Upadhye, Bombay, 1943.

36 *Mūlācāra* of Vattakera (2 Parts), Manikachandra Digambara Jaina Granthmala, Bombay, V. S. 1980.

37 *Pravacanasāra* of Kundakunda, Ed. by Dr. A. N. Upadhye, Bombay, 1935.

38 *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra*, Ed. by H. R. Kapadia, Bombay, 1926.
Sarvārthasiddhi (Auto Comm.).

Encyclopaedia, Dictionaries, etc.

1 *An Illustrated Ardha-Māgadhī Dictionary*, 5 Volumes,
by Jaina Muni Shri Ratnachandraji, Indore, 1928-38.

2 *Abhidhāna Rājendraḥ*, 7 Volumes, Ratlam, 1910 to 1914.

3 *A Practical Sanskrit Dictionary*, by A. N. Macdonell.

4 *Dictionary of Pali Propsr Names*, 2 Volumes,
by G. P. Malalasekar, London, 1937.

5 *Encyclopaedia Britanica*, 29 Volumes, University of Cambridge, 1910 to 1911.

6 *Encyclopaedia of Religion & Ethics*,
Ed. by J. Jastings, New York, 1953 to 1955.

7 *Pāia-Sadda-Mahaṇṇavo* by Pt. H. T. Seth, Calcutta, 1923.

8 *Pali English Dictionary* by R. C. Childers, 1875.

9 *Pali English Dictionary* by T. W. Rhys Davids and W. Stede, London, 1952.

10 *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* by Monier Williams, Oxford, 1951.

11 *Indian Antiquary*.

12 *Indian Historical Quarterly*.

13 *Jaina Antiquary*.

Miscellaneous

1 *A comparative study of the Pātimokkha* by Dr. W. Pachow, Santiniketan, 1955.

2 *A History of Pre-Indian Philosophy* by Dr. B.M. Barua, Calcutta, 1921.

3 *An Interpretation of Jaina Ethics* by Dr. C. Krause, Bhavnagar, 1929.

4 *Ācārya Bhikṣu Abhinandana Grantha*, Calcutta, 1961.

5 *Buddha* by Prof. H. Oldenberg, London, 1882.

6 *Buddhacariyā* by Rahula Sankrityayana, Kashi, 2475 (Buddhābda).

7 *Buddhism* by Dr. E Conze, Oxford, 1953.

8 *Buddhism* (Two Volumes) by C. H. S Ward, London, 1947, 1952.

9 *Buddhism* by T. W. Rhys Davids, London, 1876.

10 *Buddhism, a 'Mystery Religion'* by Pr. P. Levy, London, 1957.

11 *Buddhist India* by T. W. Rhys Davids, Calcutta, 1955.

12 *Buddhistic Studies*, Ed. by Dr. B. C. Law, Calcutta, 1931.

13 *Contributions to the History of Brahmanical-Asceticism (Saṁnyāsa)* by Pt. H. D. Sharma, Poona, 1939.

14 *Darśana Aur Cintana* by Pt. Sukhlalji Sanghavi, Ahmadabad, 1957.

15 *Democracy in Early Buddhist Sangha* by G. D. De, Calcutta, 1955.

16 *Early Buddhist Jurisprudence* by Miss D. N. Bhagvat, Poona, 1939.

17 *Early Buddhist Monachism* by Dr. S. Dutt, London, 1924.

18 *Early Monastic Buddhism* (Three volumes) by Dr. N. Dutt, Calcutta, 1941-1945.

19 *Eastern Monachism* by R. S. Hardy, London, 1860.

20 *Geography of Early Buddhism* by Dr. B. C. Law, London, 1932.

21 *Great Women of India,* Ed. by S. Madhavananda & R. C. Majumdar, Almora, 1953.

22 *Heart of Jainism* by Mrs. S. Stevenson, Oxford, 1915.

23 *Hinduism And Buddhism* by Sir C. Eliot, London, 1957.

24 *Hindu Law and Custom* Tr. by B. K. Ghose, Calcutta, 1928.

25 *Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies* Tr. by H. K. Beauchamp, Oxford, 1953.

26 *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas* by Dr. A. L. Basam,

27 *History of Dharmaśāstra* (5 volumes) by P. V. Kane, Poona, 1930 to 1953.

28 *History of Indian Literature* (Vol. II) by M. Winternitz, Calcutta, 1933.

29 *History of Jaina Monachism* by Dr. S. B. Deo, Poona, 1956.

30 *History of Pāli Literature* (Two Volumes) by Dr. B. C. Law, London, 1933.

31 *History of the Canonical Literature of the Jainas* by H. L. Kapadia, Surat, 1941.

32 *India as Described in Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism* by Dr. B. C. Law, London, 1941.

33 *Jaina Monastic Jurisprudence* by Dr. S. B. Deo, Banaras, 1960.

34 *Life in Ancient India as Depicted in the Jaina Canon* by Dr. J. C. Jain, Bombay, 1947.

35 *Mahāvīra Commemoration Volume* (Vol. I), Ed. by Shri K. P. Jain, Agra, 1950.

36 *Lord Mahāvīra* by Dr. Bool Chand, Banaras 1948.

37 *Mahāvīra, His Life and Teachings* by Dr. B. C. Law, London, 1937.

38 *Manual of Buddhism* by Prof. R. S. Hardy, London, 1853.

39 *Manual of Indian Buddhism* by Prof. H. Kern, 1896.

40 *Pāli Sāhitya kā Itihāsa* by Dr. B. S. Upadhyaya, Prayag, 1951.

41 *Philosophy of the Buddha* by Prof. A. J. Bahm, London, 1958.

42 *Position of Women in Hindu Civilisation* by Dr. A. S. Altekar, Banaras, 1938.

43 *Prākrit Sāhitya kā Itihāsa* by Dr. J. C. Jain, Varanasi, 1961.

44 *Pre-Buddhist India* by R. N. Mehta, Bombay, 1939.

45 *Primitive Buddhism* by Prof. E. A. Read, Chicago, 1896.

46 *Religions of Ancient India* by Prof. L. Renou, London, 1953.

47 *Sarvāstivāda Literature* by Dr. A. C. Banerjee, Calcutta, 1957.

48 *Some Jaina Canonical Sūtras* by Dr. B. C. Law, Bombay, 1949.

49 *Śramaṇa Bhagavāna Mahāvīra* by Pt. Kalyan Vijayagani, Jalor, 1941.

50 *Studies in the Bhagavatī Sūtra* by Dr. J. C. Sikdar, Muzaffarpur, 1964.

51 *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism* by Dr. G. C. Pande, Allahabad, 1957.

52 *The Cambridge History of India* by Prof. E. J. Rapson, Cambridge, 1922.

53 *The Doctrines of Jainism* by W. Schubring, Delhi, 1962.

54 *Tīrthaṅkara Vardhamāna* by S. Rampuri, Bikaner, 1953.

55 *Twenty-five Hundred Years of Buddhism*, Ed. by Dr. P. V. Bapat, Delhi, 1956.

56 *Vaiśālī Abhinandana Grantha*, Muzaffarpur, 1958.

57 *Women Under Primitive Buddhism* by Miss I. B. Horner, London, 1930.

INDEX

abaha, 182.
abbhāna, 97, 180, 213, 214.
abbhantaras, 161, 161n.
abbhokāsikaṅgaṁ, 43, 67.
abhaṅga, 148.
Abhaya, 88 ; —mātā, 99; —rājakumāra, 88.
Abhayankar, Prof. K. V., 11.
Abhidhamma(*piṭaka*), 2, 3, 59.
abhisamaya, 99.
abhisannakāya, 146, 146n.
abījaṁ, 116.
abrahmacariya, 89.
ācāra, 218 ; the meaning and scope of the word, 1 ; the salient features of Jaina, 11.
Ācārāṅga(*sūtra*), 1, 2, 115, 131, 136, 148, 152, 153, 169, 170 ; the expression, 1n.
ācariya, 45, 46, 59, 95, 96, 203, 204, 219, 226.
ācārya, 16, 24, 26, 27, 27n, 73, 80, 84, 94, 139, 152, 182, 193, 202, 231, 235, 238.
ācāryopādhyāya, 26, 27, 186.
accha, 144.
acchinnaka, 132.
acchiniya, 149
acchiveyaṇā, 148.
acela, 19, 36, 130 ; —*parisaha*, 19.
acelatva, 130.
adaṁsaṇe, 102.
ādāna, 165 ; —*nikṣepaṇa*, 33.
addhāṇateṇa, 102.
aḍḍhayoga, 54, 58, 140, 160, 179, 183.
aḍḍhoruga, 134.
adhammavādī, 221.
adhikaraṇa, 60, 214, 218, 219, 219n; —*ṣamathā*, 60, 218, 228, 229, 236, 237; *anuvādā*—, 218 ; *āpattā* –, 218, 219 ; *kiccā*—, 218, 219;*vivādā*—, 218.
adhiṭṭhāna, 164.
adinnādāna, 89, 90.
Admission, bars to, 100 ; bars to—into the Buddhist Order, 44 ; the process of, 74.
aduguñchiya, 114.
Āgamas, 4, 19, 22, 87, 106, 222, 246.
āgantuka, 138.
agārahia, 114.
aggisālā, 54, 97, 142.
ahāguruo, 224.
ahālahuo, 224.
ahālahusao, 224.
ahata, 133 ; —*kappa*, 133.
ahidaṭṭhaṇa, 146.
ahiṁsā, 30, 32, 90n, 118, 190.
āiṇapāuraṇāṇi, 131.
aisesa, 207.
Ajātaśatru, 88, 178, 179, 246
ajinakkhipa, 53, 131.
ajīraa, 148.
ājīva, 111, 218,
ajjā, 14.
ajjava, 36.
ajjhāpannaka, *antimavatthuṁ*, 154. 162.
ajjhārāme, 49, 112.
ajjhokāse, 183.
Ajitakesakambali, 61, 62.
Ājīvika, 14n, 73, 129n.
akāraya, 148.
ākāsa, 61.
Ākāsagotta, 147.
akiñcanatva, 192.
akkanāḷa, 131.
akkosa, 36.

akriyāvāda, 61.
alābha, 36.
Ālambhiyā, 177.
Alārakālāma, 74.
Āḷavī, 177.
ālepana, 146.
Alms, the way of proceeding to the village for, 122.
ālocanā, 166.
āloyaṇā, 37, 222, 229, 235, 238.
āmalaka, 144.
āmaka, —*lohita*, 145;—*maṁsa*, 145.
amanussikābādha, 145.
amāvasyā, 159, 167.
ambadhāī, 78.
Ambapāli, 88, 99.
Amila, 131.
āmisakkhāra, 146.
aṁsuyāṇi, 131.
amuḷhavinaya, 219, 220.
āṇā, 222.
anabhirati. 97.
anādāra, 165.
aṇāḍhitā, 100.
Ānanda, 41, 59, 82, 87, 88, 93, 96, 204.
anāritesu, 189.
aṇasaṇa, 37, 39, 92.
Anāthapiṇḍika, 88.
aṇatta, 102.
anatthadaṇḍaveramaṇa, 94.
aṇavaṭṭhappā, 37, 222, 223, 229, 230, 233, 234, 240.
andha, 101, 102;—*badhira*, 102;—*mūga*, 102;—*mūgabadhira*, 102.
andhillaa, 113.
Aṅgabāhyas, 7.
aṅganimittaṁ, 111.
Aṅgas, 5, 6, 7, 25, 27, 28, 136, 202, 207, 208.
aṅgavāta, 148.
Aṅgulimāla, 99.
Aṅguttaranikāya, 2, 57, 164, 166.
aniyatā, 60, 216, 228, 228n, 236.
aṇṇadhammiyānaṁ, 233.
aṇṇamaṇṇaṁ-karemāṇe, 231.
annāṇa, 36.
aññatitthiya, 48, 169.
aṇṇautthiya, 29.
Antagaḍadasāo, 5.
antarateṇa, 102.
antaravāsaka, 53, 133, 136, 137.
antarāya, 162.
antarāyikadhamma, 76.
antarijjagaṁ, 133.
antevāsika, 13. 13n, 42, 45, 89n, 95.
antoniyaṁsaṇī, 135.
Anuruddha, 88.
anusāsaka, 41, 45, 59, 60, 76, 105, 204, 214.
anussāvanā, 214.
Anūttarovavāiyadasāo, 5.
anuvāda, 218.
anuvāsana, 148.
aṇuvratas, 93, 94.
Aṇuyogaddāra, 6.
Aṇuyogas, 7.
anvaya, 201.
Apadāna, 2.
apamāra, 101, 146.
aparigraha, 17, 134, 151.
apaṭicchanna, 215.
āpatti, 217, 218.
āpattiyā, *adassane ukkhittaka*, 154; *appaṭikamme ukkhhittaka*, 154.
apāyamukhāni, 93.
appaleva, 115.
appamattavissajjaka, 206.
Appearance and outfit, of the Buddhist mendicants, 43.
apratibaddha, 233.
arahanta, 75, 104, 164.
arahantaghātaka, 45, 154.

āraññaka, 54, 138.
āraññikaṅgaṁ, 43, 67.
Arhatahood, 75, 246.
arhatula, 20, 130.
ārāma, 141, 142, 206.
ārāmikapesaka, 59, 206.
arati, 36.
ārjava, 192.
arisā, 148, 148n.
Ariṣṭanemi (the twenty-second Tīrthaṅkara), 28, 83.
Ariṭṭha, 217.
ariyasaccāni, 41.
āropetabbo, 217.
ārūḍha, 113.
Asāḷha, 23, 57, 171n, 171-75.
Āsāḷhī-pūrṇimā, 172, 175.
asamādānacāro, 138.
Asceticism, 63.
Ascetics, Brahmaṇical, 14, 15, 66, 169; Brahmavādin women, 247; Buddhist, 66; Jaina, 22, 24, 39, 122, 133, 136, 137, 154, 243, 244; non-Brahmaṇical, 63.
asenāsanika, 183.
asive, 182.
asiya, 150.
Aśoka tree, 74, 84.
āśraya, 108.
Assaji, 217.
Assam, 245.
assāva, 145.
aṣṭamī, 165, 166.
Asthikagrāma, 177.
astika, 116.
atihisaṁvibhāga, 94.
Atimuttaka, 12, 12n
atirekalābha, 48, 68, 108, 112.
atisāra, 102.
ativisa, 144.
Aṭṭhakathās, 2, 3,
aṭṭhameṇa, 224.
aṭṭhī, 117.
attudesaṁ, 141.
Ātuma, 100.
āu, 182.
auddesika, 118.
āukāiya, 31.
aupagrāhika, 187.
āura, 95.
Āurapaccakkhāṇa, 6.
Authority, competent to carry out the function, 105.
avaddahaṇa, 148.
avadhāvai, 209.
avamāriya, 148.
avaṛhāṛa, 148.
āvāsa, 46, 54, 56, 60, 75n, 82, 151, 160, 161, 163, 164, 199, 203, 213, 220, 225.
āvasatha-piṇḍa, 49, 112.
āvāsika, 138.
Āvassaya, 6.
āvaśyaka, 166, 193, 235.
Āvaśyakaniryukti, 210.
āvati, 95.
aviniya, 95.
āvuso, 42.
avvavasiya, 95.
aya, 21, 50, 119.
āyaṁbileṇa. 224.
āyaṁke, 16.
āyāṇabhaṇḍanikkhevaṇa, 36.
āyāṇi, 131.
āyāra, 1, 106, 208 ; —*kusala*, 208 ; —*pakappa*, 208, 209, 225 ; —*sampayā*, 210.
Āyāradasāo, 6.
Āyāraṅga, 5, 25.
āyariya, 38, 106, 207, 209, 210, 210n, 212, 212n, 227 ; —*uvajjhāya*, 207-11, 225-26.
āyasmā, 42.
ayyā, 42.

baddhie, 103.
badhira, 102.
bahira, 101 ; —*niyaṁsaṇī*, 135.
bahuleva, 115.
bahvābādha, 146*n*.
bāka, 53.
bāla, 113.
bālavacchā, 101, 113.
bambhacera, 36.
bandha, 120.
bandhanasuttaka, 120.
batthikamma, 148.
Begging-bowl, 118.
Beliefs and practices, Buddhist, 63 ; pre-Buddhist, 61.
Bengal, 245.
bhaddamuttaka, 144.
Bhaddavaggiyas, 75.
Bhādrapada, 23, 171, 172, 175, 192.
Bhadrila, 177.
Bhadriyā, 177.
bhagaṁdara, 102, 148.
bhagandala, 150 ; —*ābādha*, 146.
Bhagavadgītā, 62.
Bhagavatīsūtra, 147, 150, 165, 232.
bhājana, 119 ; —*vārika*, 206.
Bhallika, 41, 85.
bhaṁgiyaṁ, 20, 130.
bhaṇḍa, 119.
bhaṇḍaga, 19.
bhaṇḍāgārika, 59, 140, 205, 206.
bhante, 42.
bhāṣā, 33, 35.
Bhāṣyas, 233, 239.
bhataṁsi, 189.
bhattaggavatta, 50, 122.
Bhattapariṇṇā, 6.
bhattesaṇā, 123.
bhattuddesaka, 59, 205.
bhaya, 93, 95.
bhayae, 103.
bhayāgatiṁ, 207.
bhāyaṇa, 21.
bhaye, 182.
bhesajja, 55, 148.
Bhesajjakkhandhaka, 144.
bhesajjāni, *pañca*, 115.
bhikkhāyariyā, 37
bhikkhu, 14, 82, 126, 134 ;
  bhedakānuvattaka—, 238n ;
  —*saṅgha*, 82, 155-56.
bhikkhunī, 14, 21, 82, 84, 134 ;
  —*dūsaka*, 45, 104, 154 ;
  —*saṅgha*, 155-56.
bhogakula, 114.
Bhojapuri, 116n, 175n.
bhuñjantī, 113.
bhūtavijjā, 111.
Bihar, 245.
bila, 145.
bilva, 116.
Bimbisāra, 62, 88, 129, 147, 159, 178, 179, 243.
Bodhi tree, 73.
brahmacarya, 192.
brahmadaṇḍa, 218.
Brāhmaṇas, 164, 185, 247.
Brahmaṇical, mendicancy, 190 ; religious codes, 169; school, 173.
Brahmaṇism, 159, 247.
Brahmins, 31, 65, 105, 247.
Brāhmīsundarī, 83.
Bṛhatkalpa, 6, 209, 229, 236, 237 ; —*bhāṣya*, 233.
Brotherhood, 200, 203.
Buddha, 40-42, 44, 47-48, 54, 58, 61-64, 66-68, 73-75, 79n, 79-82, 85-86, 88-90, 93, 107, 111, 126, 129, 136, 140, 154, 160, 163, 173, 176, 178-79, 199, 216, 224-25, 232, 234, 243, 244, 246; the First Sermon of the, 2; —*vacana*, 40.
Buddhadatta, 3, 4.

Buddhaghosa (Ācārya), 1, 3, 174.
Buddhahood, 81, 246.
Buddhanāga, 3.
Buddhavaṁsa, 2.
Buddhism, 30, 73, 81, 84, 88, 90n, 101, 109, 136, 144, 159, 167, 190, 246.
Buhler, George, 7n, 8.
Burma, 44.
cāga, 71n.
cakkhuroga, 145.
cālaṇī, 135.
Cāliya-parvata, 177.
camma, 21, 119; —*kosa*, 19, 21; —*chedaka*, 21.
Campā, 177.
Candā, 99.
Candanā (Āryā), 83, 211.
Candanabālā, 77.
Candapaṇṇatti, 5.
Candavijjhaya, 6.
caṅkama, 54, 142, 146n.
Canon, Buddhist, 212; Digambara, 7; Jaina, 11, 93, 229; Pāli, 2, 3, 47, 61n, 88, 93, 246; Śvetāmbara, 5n, 7.
Cāpā, 99.
cāritta, 106, 208.
carittaṭṭhayāe, 182.
cariyā, 36.
Cariyāpiṭaka, 2.
cāṭi, 183.
cātuddisā-bhikkhu-saṅgha, 199.
cātuddisāsaṅgha, 140.
caturdasī, 165, 166.
cāturmāsa, 23, 169, 172, 184, 192.
caturvidhasaṅgha, 106.
caturviṁsatistava, 166.
cāturyāmadharma, 129n.
cātuyāma-saṁvara, 62.
cāulodaga, 117.
Causaraṇa, 6.
cauttha, 37.
cauṭṭheṇa, 224.
ceiya, 185.
cela, 21, 119.
celacilimiliya, 134.
Celanā, 88.
cetiyas, 13, 79, 80.
Ceylon, 44.
chajjīvaṇiyā, 30.
chakaṇa, 132, 145n.
chanda, 56, 93, 100, 161.
chandāgatiṁ, 207.
Chandra, 202.
Chandragupta (Maurya), 7.
Channa, 217, 218.
charika, 146.
chatta, 120, 183.
chaṭṭheṇa, 224.
Chavaggiya, 66, 123, 219.
chavakuṭika, 183.
chavasīsa, 50.
chavasīsapatta, 119.
chavidosābadha, 146.
cheda, 225, 227, 238;
Chedasūtras, 25, 27, 207, 208, 209, 212.
cheya, 37, 222, 229, 238; *pañcarā-indiya*—238.
Cheyasuttas, 6.
Childers, Prof., 108n, 200, 200n.
chinnairiyāpatha, 45, 102.
Church, administration of the Jaina, 201n, 208; Brahmanical, 105; Buddhist, 61, 66, 73, 101, 102, 114, 121, 137, 151, 212, 245; constitution of the Buddhist, 197; hierarchy, 89; hierarchy (Buddhist), 42, 46, hierarchy (Jaina), 25, 81; Jaina, 6, 14n, 21, 32, 73, 95, 101-4, 118, 119, 130, 134, 151, 152, 212, 222, 227; Pārśva's, 129n; units,

202 ; units (Buddhist), 58, 199; units (Jaina), 25, 200.
cilimili, 19, 21.
cīnaṁsuyāṇi, 131.
cīvabhājaka, 59, 205.
cīvara, 126, 138, 237; –*bhājaka*, 59, 140, 206;—*nidahaka*, 59, 140, 205, 206; —*paṭiggāhaka*, 59, 140, 205, 206.
Cīvaravaggo, 237.
ciyāya, 36.
Cloth, the purpose behind the use of, 137.
codetabbo, 217.
colapaṭṭa, 134.
Confession, Buddhist, 191n.
Conversion, Jaina ceremony of, 13, 78n.
Converts, precepts for the, 89.
Conze, Prof. Edward, 30, 244.
Council, first Buddhist, 204, 218 ; of Pāṭaliputra, 7 ; second Buddhist, 65n, 220.
Cūlapanthaka, 99.
Cullavagga, 2, 60, 81, 140.
cuṇama, 145.
cuṇṇa, 111.
Custodians, of monastic discipline, 197, 199.
Dabba, 205, 219, 224.
ḍagala, 175, 187.
dāha, 102, 148.
dāka, 49, 116 ; —*rasaṁ*, 116.
daṁsamasaga, 36.
daṁsaṇa, 36.
daṁsanaṭṭhayāe, 182.
dāna, 86.
daṇḍa, 15, 19.
danta, 21, 119.
dappa, 95.
darisaṇa, 106, 208.
Darśa, 159.
dāru, 21, 119.
dāsa, 44, 102.
dasadosavivajjiya, 110.
dasalakṣaṇaparva, 192.
dasameṇa, 224.
dasasikkhāpada, 89.
Daśāśrutaskandha, 209, 234, 236, 237 ; —*niryukti*, 172.
Dasāsuyakkhandha, 6.
Daśavaikālikasūtra, 11, 115.
Dasaveyāliya, 6, 73, 236, 237.
datlis, 122.
Deo, Dr. S. B., 8, 117n, 201, 202, 209, 210, 212n.
Desarāga, 131.
desateṇa, 102.
desāvagāsiya, 94.
Devadatta, 66, 67, 68, 107.
devasannatti, 100.
Devindatthava, 6.
dhāī, 111.
dhajabaddhacora, 102.
Dhamma, 40-42, 48, 50, 73, 75, 85, 86, 89, 90, 93, 160, 162, 204, 216, 218, 219, 224, 232.
'*Dhammadhara*, 59, 204.
Dhammapada, 2, 73.
Dhammasāmī, 4.
Dhammasaṅgaṇi, 2.
dhammopagaraṇa, 19.
dhaññaphalarasaṁ, 116.
dhanuggāha, 149.
dhāraṇā, 60, 214, 222.
Dharmaghoṣa, 32.
Dharmaśāstras, 169.
Dhātukathā, 2.
dhovana, 117n.
dhoya, 117n.
dhoyaṁ, 131.
dhruvaśīla, 169.
dhumapāna, 145.
dhutaṅgas, 43, 64, 67, 68, 92.
dhuvaloo, 35.

Digambaras, 5, 14n, 15, 15n, 19, 80, 81, 129n, 130, 192, 230.
digañchā, 36.
Dīghanikāya, 2.
dikkhā, 71n.
dikṣā, *choṭi*—72; *baḍī*—72.
disaṁ (aṇudisaṁ) viharai, 94.
Diseases and cures, 55.
disivvaya, 94.
diṭṭhi, 97, 180, 218.
diṭṭhisūla, 148.
Diṭṭhivāya, 5
divicamma, 149.
dosa, 93.
dosāgatiṁ, 207.
Draupadī, 247.
Dress, prescribed for the Buddhist mendicants, 52.
dubbhāsita, 216, 219, 238.
dubhikkhaṁsi, 189.
dugullāṇi, 131.
duguñchapattitaṁ, 137.
duguñchia, 114.
dūī, 111.
dukkaṭa, 216, 219, 238.
dukkha, 41; —*nirodha*, 41;—*nirodhagāminipaṭipadā*, 41;—*samudaya*, 41.
Duties and obligations, 89.
Dūtipalāsaka, 87.
Dutt, Dr. N., 8, 213.
Dutt, Dr. S., 8, 220, 221n.
duṭṭha, 95, 102, 231;—*pārañciya*, 231.
duṭṭhagahaṇika, 146.
duṭṭhalla, 228n.
duvālasameṇa, 224.
dvevācika, 85.
Dyeing, materials and the process of, 132.
Eating, the time of, 122.
egaṭṭhameṇa, 224.
ekāsanikaṅgaṁ, 43, 67.
Erāvaī, 23.
Erāvatī, 189.
eṣaṇā, 17, 33, 25, 112.
Faith, Buddhist, 40; Jaina, 81.
Food, allowed to the mendicants, 110; prescribed for the Buddhist mendicants, 49; process of eating, 129; purpose of taking, 121; quantity of 121; storing up articles of, 127; way of receiving, 125.
Food and drink, proper and improper articles of, 114.
gaccha, 25, 26, 200, 201, 201n, 202.
gadrabha, 144.
gāhaka, *paṭirūpe*, 154.
gahapati-cīvara, 53, 129.
Gajjala, 131.
galagaṇḍī, 101.
galantakoḍha, 149.
gāmateṇa, 102.
gaṇa, 25, 25n, 26n, 38, 58, 59, 197, 199, 200, 200n, 201, 202, 207, 211, 231n, 233, 243; —*bhojana*, 49, 112; —*dhara*, 26, 27, 28n, 88, 171, 197, 207; —*hara*, 210, 210n; —*pratibaddha*, 233.
gaṇaṁgaṇiya, 25n.
gaṇāvacchedaka, 26, 27, 186.
gaṇāvacchedin, 152.
gaṇāvaccheiṇī, 212.
gaṇāvaccheiya, 207, 211, 212n, 226.
gaṇḍa, 101, 160.
gaṇḍābādha, 146.
gandhalepa, 146.
gaṇḍī, 101, 148.
Gaṅgā, 23, 189.
gaṇin, 26, 27, 80, 153, 207, 210; —*sampayā*, 210, 211.
gaṇiṇī, 212.
Gaṇivijjā, 6.
gārahia, 114.

gāratthiya, 133.
Gārgī, 81.
garhā, 166.
garudhamma, 41, 82.
gatatta, 63.
Gautamī, Mahāprajāpati, 41, 82, 88, 212.
gelaṇṇe, 182.
geruka, 14, 145.
gharadinnakābādha, 146.
ghaṭikaṭāha, 50, 119.
ghee, 149, 150.
ghusulintī, 113.
Gihīvinaya, 93.
gilāna, 38, 180.
gilāsaṇi, 148.
gocchaga, 14, 121.
gosisa, 149.
Gotama, 62.
gotta, 42.
goyarabhoyana, 110.
goyarī, 123.
guhā, 54, 140, 160, 183.
Gujarat, 245.
guliya. 149.
guḷodaka, 49, 116.
gumma, 202.
Guṇaśilakacaitya, 78.
guṇavvayas, 93, 94.
guptis, 16, 35, 36, 91.
gurū, 16, 19, 37, 45, 152, 193n, 223; —*parivāra*, 26, 202.
gurugatarāo, 224.
guruo, 224.
gūtha, 146.
guvviṇī, 101, 113.
haliddi, 144.
hammiya, 54, 58, 140, 160, 183.
hārapuḍa, 119.
Hardy, Prof. R. S., 8, 71n.
Hari, 114
haritakīkhaṇḍa, 55n.
Hāritasaṁhitā, 247.
hatthachinna, 102.
hatthakamma, 231.
hatthatālaṁ, 233.
hatthindu, 113.
Hedonism, 63.
Heretics, 243; Buddhists' relation with, 47; conversion of, 88; conversion of—into the Buddhist Order, 48; Jaina attitude towards, 29.
Hierarchy, of officers, 198 ;Buddhist, 98, 106, 203, 205; Jaina, 207, 212, 223, 235, 238.
Himalayas, 244.
hiṁsā, 25.
Hindu, community, 118.
Hinduism, 244.
hiṅgu, 144.
hiṅgulaka, 144.
hiraṇṇa, 119.
Hiraṇyakesin, 159.
hiripattitaṁ, 137.
Horner, I. B., 8.
ihaloga, 100.
Ikṣavāku, 114.
iṇāyaka, 102.
India, 244, 245; ancient, 144.
Indrabhūti, 14n, 77, 210.
iriyā, 33, 35; —*patha*, 13, 80, 127.
Itivuttaka, 2.
itthī, 36.
itvara, 37.
Jacobi, Prof. H., 8, 26, 201, 202.
jaḍḍa, 102.
Jāgarā Thera, 3.
jahajāya, 15.
Jain, Dr. H. L., 8.
Jainism, 8, 30, 73, 77, 84, 87, 88, 90n, 101, 118, 136, 144, 159, 166, 167, 178, 190, 201n, 239, 243, 244, 246.
jalla, 36.
Jamāli, 78.
jambu, 116.

Jambuddivapaṇṇatti, 5.
Jamunā, 189.
jaṅgiyaṁ, 130.
jantāghara, 54, 142 ; —*vattaṁ*, 142n.
Japan, 244.
jara, 102, 148.
jarādubbala, 104.
jaria, 113.
Jātaka, 2.
jātarūparajata, 65n;—*paṭiggahana*, 90.
Jaṭilas, 48, 62, 73, 75, 88.
jātithera, 152.
Jaūṇā, 23.
Java, 244.
jāyaṇā, 36.
Jayantī, 88.
Jetavanavihāra, 185.
Jenta, 99.
jie, 222.
Jinakalpika, 21, 35, 123, 130.
jīnas, 80.
Jinavijayaji, Muni, 8.
jīraka, 116n.
jīramānī, 116n.
Jiṭṭhagaṇi, 210.
Jīvābhigama, 5.
Jīvaka, 88, 129.
Jīvakakomārabhacca, 147.
Jīyakappa, 6.
jhāna, 38, 92.
jhimiya, 148.
joga, 111.
Jurisprudence, Buddhist, 154,
Jyeṣtha, 171n.
kāca, 50, 119.
kacchu, 149.
kaddama, 188.
kahaṇā, 80.
kakka, 150.
kākuṭṭepaka, 45, 103.
Kālakācārya, 192.
kāḷaloṇa, 145.
kālañjana, 145.
kālapratikramaṇa, 16.
Kalpasūtra, 83, 115.
Kalyāṇavijaya Gaṇi, Pt., 8, 178n.
kambala, 14, 21, 53, 130, 131.
kaṁji, 115.
kammakilesa, 93.
kammas, 180.
kammavācā, 161, 214, 215.
kaṁsa, 50, 119.
kāṇa, 102.
kañcuka, 131, 135.
kanda, 18, 116.
kaṇḍu, 145, 148 ; —*paṭicchādiṁ*, 53, 134, 136.
kaṇṇaveyaṇā, 148.
kaṇikka, 149.
kāṇiya, 148.
Kaṅkhāyojanā, 4 ; *Mahāṭīkā*, 4,
Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī, 3 ; —*abhinavaṭīkā*, 4 ; —*gaṇṭhi*, 4 ; —*ṭīkā*, 3.
Kapadia, Prof. H. R., 5n, 8.
kapalla, 145.
Kapilavastu, 41, 81, 177.
Kappa, 6.
kappāsa, 53, 144.
kappāsikaṁ, 130.
Kappāvaḍaṁsiāo, 6.
kappiyabhūmi, 52, 127.
kappiyakāraka, 52, 128.
kappiyakuṭi, 54, 142.
kārakabhedaka, 102.
karmas, 62.
Kārtika, 23, 138, 171, 172.
kāsa, 102, 148.
kasāhata, 102.
kasāya, 14, 43, 53, 131.
Kassapa, 99 ; brothers, 66 ; the naked ascetic, 63.
Kathāvatthu, 2.
kaṭhina, 53, 135, 137, 138, 152-55, 234.
kaṭhinuddhāra, 136.
kaṭukarohiṇī, 144.

Kātyāyana Śrautasūtra, 159.
kausagga, 92, 238.
Kauśāmbī, 88, 177.
kavala, 122.
kāveyyaṁ, 111.
kāya, 36 ; —*bandhana*, 44 ; —*duggandha*, 145 ; —*kilesa*, 37.
Kāyaha, 131.
kāyotsarga, 16, 166, 167.
Kern, Prof. H., 8, 72.
Kesakambala, 131.
Kesi, 14n.
khajjabhājaka, 59, 205.
khalupacchābhattikaṅgaṁ, 43, 67.
khamāvaṇā (kṣamāpaṇā), 191.
khāṇateṇa, 102.
khandhakaraṇī, 135.
khandharajana, 132.
khañja, 102.
khanti, 36.
khāra, 175.
khettātikaṁta, 122.
khittacitta, 154.
khoma, 53, 130.
khomiyaṁ, 130.
khuḍḍaga, 13.
Khuddakanikāya, 2, 43.
Khuddakapāṭha, 2.
Khuddakasikkhā, 4; *abhinavaṭīkā*, 4; —*ṭīkā*, 4
khuḍḍiyā, 13, 38.
khujiya, 148.
khujja, 102.
Khujjasobhita, 100.
kicca, 218.
kiḍibha, 149.
kilāsa, 101, 146
kimikuṭṭha, 149
Kisāgotamī, 99
kītaṁ, 131.
kiva, 103.
koḍha, 148.
koha, 111.
kolacuṇṇa, 115.
Koliyakassapa, 4.
Kosambiji, 55n.
koseyya, 53, 130.
koṭikkhata, 101.
koṭṭhaka, 54, 97, 142.
kriyāvāda, 61.
kriyāvādins, 62.
krosa, 24, 124, 184.
kṣamā, 192.
kucchikimiya, 150.
kucchisūla, 148.
kuḍamuha, 187.
kuhanā, 111.
kukkuḍamaṁsa, 147.
kukkuḍīaṇḍapamāṇa, 122.
kukucca, 97, 180.
kula, 26, 26n, 38, 200, 200n, 201, 202; —*dūsaka*, 216.
Kumbhaka, 84.
kuṇḍi, 15.
kuṇī, 102.
Kūṇika, 88.
kūṇiya, 148.
kuṇṭa, 101, 102.
kunthu, 182.
kusa, 53, 131, 165.
kuṭaja, 144.
kuṭṭha, 101, 146, 148.
lāghava, 36.
lahuka-āpatti, 220.
lahuo, 224.
lahusatarāo, 224.
lahutarāo, 224.
lakkhaṇāhata, 102.
lakkhaṇaṁ, 111.
lapanā, 111.
Lassen, Prof., 90n.
lāu, 21, 119.
Law, Dr. B.C., 3n, 8, 214n.
Lay-disciples, coversion of, 85.

leva, 115.
Life, corporate, 186.
likhitaka, 102.
liṅgādibhedaṁ, 231.
Literature, exegetical, 6, 7; Indian, 118; Pali, 141.
lobha, 111.
loddha, 150.
loha, 50.
Lohitaka, 217.
lohitamocana, 146.
lohituppādaka, 45, 104.
lohiyavacca, 148n.
Lokāyatas, 61, 66.
loṇasovīra, 145.
loṇasoviraka, 116, 116n.
loya, 35, 186.
maccha, 144.
Macdonell, 1n.
Mackenzie, Col., 8.
maddava, 36.
madhu, 144.
madhugolaka, 49.
madhukapuppharasaṁ, 116.
madhumeha, 148.
Magadha, 88, 147, 159, 178.
Magahī, 116n, 175n.
mahābhūtas, 61.
Mahākappin, 56, 164.
mahalliyā, 38.
Mahānisīha, 6.
Mahāpaccakkhāṇa, 6.
Mahāpanthaka, 99.
mahāparinibbāna, 179.
mahāpātaka, 105, 246.
Mahāsāmī, 4.
mahāthera, 42, 89, 89n, 204n.
mahātherī, 42.
Mahāvagga, 1, 57, 64, 65, 85, 129, 139, 141, 144, 164, 213.
Mahāvajirabuddhi, of Ceylon, 4.
Mahāvinayasaṅgahappakaraṇa, 4.
Mahāvīra, 7, 14n, 19, 26-7, 48, 61n, 73-4, 77, 77n, 78, 78n, 80, 83, 87, 107, 129, 129n, 130, 171, 173, 176-79, 197, 200, 210, 212.
mahāvratas, 35, 35n.
mahavvaya, 31, 90, 90n, 94; *pañca*—, 90.
Mahāyasa, 4.
Mahī, 23, 189.
mahusittha, 188.
māi, 211.
Maitreyī, 81.
majja, 145.
majjārakaḍa, 147.
Majjhima Janapada, 214.
Majjhimanikāya, 2.
majjhimāpaṭipadā, 43, 64.
Makkhaligosāla, 61n.
malayāṇi, 131.
mallaga, 175n.
mallaka, 175n.
mallaya, 175, 175n.
mallayatiga, 187.
Malli (the nineteenth Tīrthaṅkara), 81n, 83, 84.
malorika, 121.
maṁsa, 117.
mana, 36.
māṇa, 111.
mānatta, 47, 82, 97, 186, 213, 215, 215n, 218, 232, 234.
Māṇava, 100.
maṇḍala, 26.
maṇḍalī, 202.
maṇḍapa, 54, 142.
maṅgala, 80.
maṅgalamantra, 13.
maṇi, 50, 119.
Māṅkula-parvata, 177.
manta, 111.
Manu, 84, 118, 212n, 247.

manussaviggaha, 231.
mārdava, 192.
Mārgaśīrṣa, 172.
Materialists, 61, 66.
Mātikādhara, 59, 204.
Mātikās, 59, 204.
Mātikaṭṭhakathā, 3.
matisampayā, 211.
matta, 113.
mattikā, 50, 119, 145n, 146.
maṭṭiyā, 21, 119.
mātughātaka, 45, 104, 154.
Maudaglyāyana, 88.
māyā, 111.
Megha, 78, 88.
mehuṇa, 90, 231.
Mettiyā, 219, 224.
Milindapañho, 3.
Mithilā, 83, 84, 178.
Mlecchas, 22.
moca, 116.
Moggallāna, 75; of Ceylon, 4.
moha, 93.
mohāgatiṁ, 207.
mokṣa, 74.
Monachism, 119; Buddhist, 197; Indian, 71: Jaina. 1, 7, 85.
Monastic, administration, 197, 228; administration in the Buddhist Order, 58; community as a whole, 244; discipline (Jaina), 183; life (Buddhist), 100, 119: observances in the Buddhist Order, 55, 160; origin and development of the Jaina —system, 77; rules (Jaina), 11, 12.
Mongolia, 244.
Monier Williams, 1n.
Monk (Jaina), conditions for—life, 12; daily duties of a, 14; moral life of the, 33; relation with laymen, 29; signs of a, 15; the appearance and the outfit of a, 14; the requisites of a, 17.
Monkhood, 106; defined, 11 (Jaina).
Monks, conversion of, 74.
Monks and nuns, mutual relation between, 28 (Jaina); relation between, 46 (Buddhist).
moyāvaittā, 100.
Mṛgāvatī, 88.
muddhasūla, 148.
mūḍha, 95, 102.
mūga, 102; —*badhira*, 102.
mugga, 49, 116.
muhapotti, 14, 15, 21, 134.
mukhapuñchana-colaka, 134.
mūla, 18, 37, 116, 222, 223, 229, 232, 238.
Mūlācāra, 7.
mūlakamma, 111.
mūlarajana, 132.
Mūlasikkhā, 4; —*abhinavaṭīkā*, 4; —*ṭīkā*, 4.
Mūlasūtras, 6, 25, 27, 28, 136, 202, 231.
mūlāyapaṭikassanā, 97, 180, 218.
mūlāyapaṭikassanāraho, 162.
munis, Brahmanical, 243.
musāvāda, 89.
musāvāya, 90.
Muttā, 100.
mutta, 146.
muttaharitaka, 146.
mutti, 36.
mūya, 148.
Mysore, 245.
nābhipramāṇa, 188.
nābhoga, 95.
naccagītavāditavisūkadassana, 89.
Nādīkassapa, 99.
Nāgendra, 202.
nagiṇa, 19, 130.
Nālā, 177.
Nālandā, 144, 177, 178.

nālikā, 188.
ṇāṇa, 106, 208.
nāṇaṭṭhayāe, 182.
Nandaka, 88.
Nandi, 6.
napuṁsaka, 103.
Ṇāṭa clan, 74.
Ñātṛdharmakathāṅga, 7.
nattamāla, 144.
natthukamma, 145, 145n.
ñatti, 60, 76, 162, 197, 214, 217, 220, 221, 221n.
ñatticatutthakamma, 75n, 214; —*upasampadā*, 75, 79, 80.
ñattidutiyakamma, 75n, 214, 215.
nāva, 183.
navakammika, 54, 59, 140, 187, 206, 226.
navakoṭiparisuddha, 110.
navanīta, 144.
Nāyādhammakahāo, 5.
Neminātha, 12n, 100, 100n.
nessajjikaṅgaṁ, 43, 67.
nibbatobījaṁ, 116.
Niddesa, 2.
Nigaṇṭha, 48, 62, 84, 87; —ṇāṭaputta, 61, 61n.
Nigaṇṭhī, 84.
niggaṇṭha, 14.
niggaṇṭhī, 14.
Nigrodhārāma, 81.
nijjaraṭṭhāṇa, 35n.
nijjuhana, 231n.
Nikāyas, 48, 62, 67, 93.
nikkhamaṇa, 71n.
nikṣepa, 165.
nimantana, 205.
nimba, 144.
nimmaṇimalasa, 101.
nindā, 166.
nippesikatā, 111.
nirjarā, 62.
nirūha, 148.
nirvāṇa, 179.
Niryāvalio, 5.
Niryuktis, 25, 142, 183.
Nisīha, 6.
nisīhiyā, 36.
Niśītha (*sūtra*), 229, 232, 234, 236, 237.
niśraya, 108.
nissaggiyā, 60, 138, 216, 219; —*pācittiyā*, 228, 229, 236, 237.
nissaya, 42, 46, 48, 64, 65, 68, 77, 91, 94, 95, 96, 106-109, 140, 180, 225, 226.
nissayakamma, 217.
Nivṛtti, 202.
nivvīeṇa, 224.
niyalabaddha, 113.
Nunhood, Jaina, 12.
Nuns, conversion of, 80; the Jaina Order of, 27.
obaddha, 103.
Offences and punishments, 215.
Officers (Buddhist), in-charge of food and drink, 205; in-charge of lodging places, 206; in-charge of robes, 205; of the Buddhist Order, 59.
Oghaṇijjutti, 6.
Oghaniryukti, 136, 175.
okacchiya, 135.
Oldenberg, Prof. H., 8, 71-73, 203.
omāṇe, 182.
omoyariya, 170, 182.
Order (Brahmaṇical) 71; (Buddhist), 1, 43, 47, 48, 54-57, 59, 66, 71, 79, 80, 84, 92, 95, 101, 103-5, 110, 119, 127, 134, 137, 138, 140, 144, 150, 152, 153, 156, 170, 172, 173, 176, 181, 182, 186, 197,

202, 203, 212, 213, 224, 239, 243; admission to the, 40; division of the, 128; formation of the, 40; rules and regulations of the, 68; (Jaina), 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 13, 17, 33, 71, 72, 77, 80, 84, 85, 90, 91, 95, 97, 103-5, 110, 121, 123, 131, 133, 134, 150, 170, 172, 173, 176, 181, 182, 186, 187, 190, 197, 202, 207, 221-26, 231, 239; constitution of the, 197; formation of the, 11.

Orissa, 85.

osaha, 148.

Ovavāiya, 5.

pabbajjā, 40, 45, 60, 71, 71n, 72, 74, 83, 103, 105, 186, 213; authority competent to confer, 45; *tisaraṇagamana*—40.

pabbājanīya, 180;—*kamma*, 216, 217.

pabbajjita, 42, 89.

pabbavāta, 146.

pacchaṇa, 148.

pacchimikā, 57, 171, 172.

Pachow, Dr., 229.

Pācittiya, 2.

pācittiyā, 60, 216, 219, 228-30, 234-37.

Pācityādiyojanā, 4.

pāda, 119.

pādabhañjana, 146.

pādachinna, 102.

paḍala, 121, 134, 187.

padamagga, 29.

pādaphālana, 146.

paḍhama-pāusammi, 172.

paḍiggaha, 21, 78, 119.

paḍihāriya, 151.

paḍikkamaṇa, 37, 186, 193, 222, 229, 230, 235, 238, 240.

paḍilehaṇa, 31.

paḷimā, 39, 39n, 92, 94; *abambhavajjaṇa*—,94; *bhaddā*—,38; *bhaduttarā*—, 38; *canda*—, 38; *daṁsaṇa*—, 94; *javamajjhā*—38; *mahābhaddā*—,38; *moya*—, 38; *paḍimā*—, 94; *posaha*—, 94; *sacittāhāravajjaṇa*—,94; *sāmāiya*—, 94; *savvaobhaddā*—,38; *sayamārambhavajjaṇa*—,94; *samaṇabhūya* —, 94; *subhaddā*—, 38; *uddiṭṭhabhattavajjaṇa*—, 94; *vairamajjhā*—, 38; *vaya*—, 94; *bhikkhupaḷimā*, 39, 39n; *ahorāiyā*—, 39; *aṭṭhamiyā*—, 39; *caumāsiyā*—, 39; *dasadasamiyā*—, 39; *doccā sattarāindiyā*—, 39; *domāsiyā*—, 39; *egarāiyā*—, 39; *māsiyā*—, 39; *navanavamiyā*—, 39; *paḍhamā sattarāindiyā*—, 39; *pañcamāsiyā*—, 39; *tacca sattarāindiyā* —, 39; *timāsiyā*—, 39.

paḍipucchaṇā, 16.

paḍissutā, 100.

pagaria, 113.

Paiṇṇas, 6.

pajjusana, 191, 192, 194.

pakkamati, 154.

pakkava, 144.

pakkha, 53.

pakkhahata, 45, 102.

pakkhika, 205.

Pakudhakaccāyana, 61n.

palibodhas, 154.

Pālimuttakavinayasaṅgaha, 4.

pālukimiya, 150.

pāmā, 149.

pamāda, 95.

pamatta, 231.

paṁsukūla, 53, 139, 155; —*cīvara*, 48, 64, 68, 128.

paṁsukūlikaṅgaṁ, 43, 67.

pāṇāivāya, 90.

pāṇātipāta, 89.
pañcadasī, 165.
Pañcakappa, 6.
pañcāṇuvvaiyaṁ, 87.
Pañcavaggiya, 40, 64, 66, 74, 107.
Pañcavastuka, 79, 80.
paṇḍaka, 103, 154, 162, 217.
Pāṇḍava, 247.
Paṇḍuka, 217.
paṇḍumattika, 132.
paṇḍurogābādha, 146.
paṅgu, 101.
paṅgulā, 102.
Paṇhāvāgaraṇāiṁ, 5.
pāṇipāya, 15.
paṇitabhojanāni, 115.
paṇiyavārika, 205.
paṇṇā, 36.
paṇṇattikusala, 208.
Pannavaṇā, 5.
pāpakamma, 93.
pāparogī, 101.
pāpasamācāra, 216.
pāpikāya diṭṭhiyā, appaṭinissagge ukkhittaka, 154.
Pārājika, 2.
pārājika, 60, 215, 219, 228n, 228-32, 236, 240.
Pārājikakaṇḍayojanā, 4.
paramparābhojana, 49, 112.
pārañciya, 37, 222, 223, 229-31, 231n, 240.
parayāya, 208, 209.
paribhaṇḍa, 120.
paribhoga, 17.
parīcchā, 80.
pariggaha, 63, 90.
parihāra, 223, 225, 227, 230, 233, 234, 240; —*viśuddhi*, 233, 234.
parijuṇṇā, 100.
parijuṇṇe, 130.
parikkhāra, 44, 98, —*colaka*, 134.
Pārileyyaka, 177.
parimitopadhi, 152.
parīsaha, 19, 36, 39, 92;—*vattiyaṁ*, 137.
pārityaga, 230n.
Parivāra, 2.
parivāsa, 73, 88, 97, 180, 186, 213, 215, 215n, 218, 223, 232, 234, 240; *apaṭicchanna*, 215; *paṭicchanna* —215, 215n, 218; *samodhāna*—, 215, 218; *suddhanta*—215, 218.
pariveṇa, 54, 97, 142.
parivusie, 130.
pāriyaṭṭaṇā, 16.
pariyāya, 225, 226, 233, 238, 239.
Pārśva (the twenty-third Tīrthaṅkara), 14n, 28, 74, 83, 129n; followers of, 133.
parva, 165-67.
pāsāda, 54, 140, 160, 179, 183.
pasata, 145n.
pāsavaṇavisayā, 38.
pāṭidesaniyā, 60, 216, 219, 228-30, 234, 235, 237, 240.
Pātimokkha, 3, 47, 56, 59, 60, 92, 106, 160, 162-64, 166, 167, 180, 183, 203, 217, 225; *Bhikkhu*—, 228; *Bhikkhunī*—,228; —*padaṭṭhavaṇṇanā*, 4; —*visodhanī*, 4.
paṭinivāsa, 96.
paṭiññātakaraṇa, 219, 220.
pāṭipadika, 205.
Paṭisambhidāmagga, 2.
paṭisāraṇīya, 180;—*kamma*, 216,217.
paṭola, 144.
pātra, 21, 119.
patta, 50, 118, 131.
paṭṭa, 134.
pattabandha, 121.
pattaggāhāpaka, 206.
pattapiṇḍikaṅgaṁ, 43, 67.
pattarajana, 132.

pattathavika, 120.
Paṭṭhāna, 2.
pattuṇṇāṇi, 131.
paurṇamāsa, 159.
pauṣadha, 165-67.
Pāvā, 178.
pavāraṇā, 43, 55, 58, 135, 174, 191, 191n, 194.
pāvarāṇi, 131.
pavatti, 207, 211.
pavattinī, 105, 212.
pavvayanakusala, 208.
pavvayāveha, 79.
pāya, 14, 21, 119.
pāyaccitta, 37.
pāyalehaṇiā, 187.
pāyapaḍilehaṇiā, 121.
pāyapuñchaṇa, 14, 15, 21.
pāyaṭṭhavana, 121.
payogasampayā, 211.
pesa, 131.
Petavatthu, 2.
phaḍḍaya, 202.
phalabhājaka, 59, 205.
phalaka, 131.
phalarajana, 132.
phalika, 50, 119.
Phaliya, 131.
phaṇahatthaka, 102.
phāṇita, 144.
phārusaka, 116.
picchiya, 15.
pīḍhasappi, 148.
pilaga, 150.
pilaka, 145.
piṇḍacārikavatta, 50, 122.
Piṇḍaṇijjutti, 6.
Piṇḍaniryukti, 115.
piṇḍapātikaṅgaṁ, 43, 67.
piṇḍiyolopabhojana, 48, 64, 68, 110.
pippala, 144.
pippalaga, 21.
Piṭakas, 2, 3, 40, 87.
pittajara, 147, 148n, 149.
piṭṭhakhādanīya, 49, 116.
pitughātaka, 45, 104, 154.
pivāsā, 36.
pokkharaṇi, 54, 142.
Polity, laws of, 197, 198; Buddhist, 213; Jaina; 222.
Porāṇaṭīkā, 4.
porisī, 15, 16, 19, 122, 128; *attha*—, 193, 193n; *sutta*—, 193, 193n.
posadha, 165, 192.
posaha, 159, 165, 168; *pakkhiya*—, 165; —*sālā*, 165.
posahovavāsa, 94.
poṭṭayaṁ, 20, 130.
potthaka, 131.
Poṭṭilā, 100, 100n.
ppayosa, 95.
Prabhāvati, 84.
Practices (Buddhist), ascetic, 43.
prajñā, 40.
Prasenajita, 88.
pratikramaṇa, 13, 19, 39, 80, 127, 166, 167; *uttamārtha*—, 167.
pratimās, 38, 39; *bhikṣu*—, 36.
Prātimokṣa, 197, 198, 215, 228, 229, 230, 232, 236, 238-40.
pratipadā, 174.
pratyākhyāna, 166.
prauṣadha, 165.
pravartinī, 26, 27, 94, 152.
prāyaścittas, 133, 153, 166, 197, 198, 222, 223, 228, 230, 234-36, 239.
Precepts, prescribed for the Buddhists, 42.
Priesthood, Buddhist, 199; Jaina, 200-2, 212.
Pṛṣṭhacampā, 177.
pucchā, 80.
puḍhavīkāiyā, 30.

Puggalapaññatti, 2.
Punabbasuka, 217.
punarvratopasthāpana, 223.
Puṇṇā, 212.
puppharajana, 132.
Pupphiāo, 6.
Pūraṇakassapa, 61n.
Puraṇamāsa, 159.
puraokaṭṭu (kātuṁ) viharai, 94.
puraopaḍibaddhā, 100.
purimaḍḍheṇa, 224.
purimikā, 57, 171.
purisadūsaka, 103.
pūrṇimā, 167.
Puṣpakūlā, 83.
puṭapāka, 148.
pūtimutta, 55, 55n, 91, 144;—*bhesajja*, 48, 65, 68, 144.
puyāvaittā, 100.
Rāḍha, 177.
raibhoyaṇa, 231.
rāinia, 226.
rāiṇṇakula, 114.
rājabhaṭa, 44.
Rājagṛha, 78, 140, 176-79, 185.
rajananippaka, 145n.
Rajasthan, 245.
Rājāyatana, 85.
Rājīmatī, 12n, 100, 100n.
rajoharaṇa, 13.
Rājupālikā, 74.
rasañjana, 145.
rasapariccāga, 37.
rasatyāga, 39.
rattaṁ, 131.
Raṭṭhapāla, 99.
rāyaduṭṭhe, 182.
rayaharaṇa, 14, 15, 78, 80.
rāyaṁsi, 148.
Rāyapaseṇaijja, 5.
rāyapiṇḍa, 18.
rāyāvagārī, 103.
Recluse, characteristics of a Jaina, 62.
Reed, Mr. E. A., 65.
Renow, Prof. Louis, 191n, 238.
Renunciation, causes of, 12,44, 99.
Requisites, ownership, succession, distribution and exchange of the, 151.
Residence, and bed prescribed for the Buddhist mendicants, 54; conditions for permanent transfer of the, 181.
Retreat, causes of the Institution of the, 170; how to enter upon the 174; indispensability of the, 176; occasions for the interruption of the, 179; periods and their duration, 171; places fit for observing the, 183; *saṅgha-kamma* performed during the, 186; some privileges due to the institution of the, 186; some special features of the Jaina, 188; the Jaina and the Buddhist, 190.
Ṛg-Veda, 1.
Rhys Davids, 1n, 8, 108.
ririya, 119.
Robes, laying aside of, 137; material and colour of, 130; materials for, 138; number of, 133; preparation of, 132; size of, 136.
Rockhill, Prof., 8.
roga, 36, 101.
rogiṇītā, 100.
Roja Malla, 88.
rosa, 100
Ṛṣabha (the first Tīrthaṅkara), 27, 83.
Ṛṣipatana, 85, 176.
rukkhamūla, 54.

rukkhamūlasenāsana, 48, 64, 68, 140.
rukkhamūlikaṅgaṁ, 43, 67.
rukkhasusira, 183.
rukkhaviṭabhiya, 183.
rupiya, 50, 119.
sabala, 25.
sabbakaṇha, 131.
sabbalohita, 131.
sabbamahānāmaratta, 131.
sabbamahāraṅgaratta, 131.
sabbamañjiṭṭha, 131.
sabbanīla, 131.
sabbapīta, 131.
sabhaya, 188.
sacca, 36.
saccapainnā vavahārā, 224.
Saḍavana, 74.
saḍḍhāna, 230, 231.
saddhivihārika, 42, 45, 89n, 95.
saḍgurū, 239.
sādhus, 80.
saḍlahu, 239.
sāgāriyapiṇḍa, 111n.
sāhammiyāṇaṁ, 233.
Sahampati, Brahmā, 74.
sāhās, 201.
Sahaśra Āmravana, 84.
sahassakāra, 95.
sāhu, 14.
sāhuṇi, 14.
śaikṣamānā, 89n.
sajjātarī, 22.
sajjāyarapiṇḍa, 18.
sajjhāya, 16, 38.
sajjulasa, 144.
sakaṇṇajappaka, 221.
sākhā, 26, 201, 202.
Sakkaputtiya, 91; monks, 131.
sakkarapameha, 101.
sakkārapurakkhāra, 36.
sakkuli, 115.
Śakra, 84.
Sakulā, 99.
sakuṇavijjā, 111.
Sākyan, 41, 82.
Śākyaputtiya, monks, 183.
Sākyas, 48.
salāka, 197, 221;—*bhatta*, 205;
—*ggahāpaka*, 221.
Sāla tree, 74.
sāmācārī, 201.
samādhi, 40.
sāmāiya, 94.
samaṇā, 169.
samānasaṁvāsaka, 202.
sāmaṇera, 13, 42, 60, 95, 106, 154,
156, 162, 179, 203, 213, 217;
—*pesaka*, 59, 204.
sāmaṇerī, 42, 47, 95, 156, 162, 179.
Sāmaññaphalasutta, 62.
samaṇopāsaga, 85.
samaṇopāsigā, 85.
Samantapāsādikā, 3, 174;—*yojanā*, 3.
samāpatti, 219.
Sāmāvatī, 88.
Samavāyāṅga (*sūtra*), 5, 27, 35, 106,
171, 207, 211.
sāmāyika, 13, 80, 166, 167.
saṁbhogas, 25, 26, 200-2.
saṁgārapavvajjā, 100.
Saṁhitas, 247.
Samitigutta, 100.
samitis, 33, 35, 91.
saṁjama, 36.
saṁkama, 29.
saṁkha, 21.
saṁkhaḍi, 18.
saṁkita, 95.
saṁlehaṇa, 182.
saṁlekhaṇa, 37.
saṁlīnayā, 37.
sammukhavinaya, 218, 219.
samodhāna, 215.
samodhānaparivāsa, 223.

sampadhūmitaṁ, 131.
saṁstāra, 165.
Saṁthāra, 6.
sāmudda, 145.
samukkasana, 231n.
saṁvara, 62.
saṁvatsarī, 192.
saṁvega, 99.
saṁyama, 30, 33, 192.
Saṁyuttanikāya, 2.
sāṛa-bhaṅga, 53.
sāṇaṃ-bhaṅgaṃ, 130.
sāṇayaṁ, 20, 130.
Saṅgha, 1, 2, 3, 38, 45, 48, 57-59, 75-77, 82, 89, 90, 93, 104-6, 129, 141, 151, 152, 154-6, 160, 164, 170, 171, 173, 180, 181, 197-200, 206, 213-17, 219-21, 224-26, 232, 243;—*bhatta*, 205; —*bheda*, 45;—*bhedaka*, 104, 105; entry into the, 100;—*kusala*, 208; *parivrājaka*—,89; *samaṇa*—, 85; *samaṇī*—85;—*sampayā*, 211.
saṅghāḍi, 135.
saṅghādisesa, 60, 215, 218, 219, 228n, 228-30, 232-34, 240.
saṇgha-kammas, 58-60, 79, 105, 181, 186, 199, 213, 215, 219, 232; semi—, 106; transaction of non-disciplinary and non-disputatious, 214, 215.
Saṅgharakkhita, 4.
saṅghārāmas, 199.
saṅghāṭi, 53, 133, 136, 137.
Sanghavi, Pt. Shri Sukhalalji, 168.
Sañjayavelaṭṭhiputta, 61n.
saṅkamite, 182.
Sankṛityāyana, Mahāpaṇḍita Rāhula, 8.
santarā cheda, 223.
santarācheya, 239.
santaruttara 14n.
santhāraya, 175.
santhava, 111.
sapadānacārikaṅgaṁ, 43, 67.
sappa, 182.
sappi, 144.
Sāranātha, 85, 176.
sāraṇitā, 100.
Sāratthadīpanīṭīkā, 3.
Sarāū, 23, 189.
sāretabbo, 217.
Sāriputra, 88.
Sāriputta, 75; of Ceylon, 3, 4, disciple of, 4.
sarīrasampayā, 211.
sarīravoccheyaṇaṭṭhāe, 16.
Sarvasiddhāntasaṅgraha, 61.
Sarvāstivāda, 3.
sāsa, 102, 148.
Śāstā, 222.
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, 159.
sativinaya, 219, 220.
sāṭiyaggahāpaka, 59, 206.
sattasikkhāvvaiyaṁ, 87.
sattha, 183;—*vasena*, 172.
satthakamma, 146.
satthapariṇata, 22.
sattucuṇṇa, 115.
satya, 192.
śauca, 192.
sāvaga, 85;—*saṅgha*, 85.
sāvaka, 1.
sāvigā, 85;—*saṅgha*, 85.
sāvikā, 1.
Schubring, Dr. W., 8, 130, 211n.
Scriptures, Jaina, 30, 39, 99, 165.
sedakamma, 146.
seha, 13, 42, 89, 95, 105, 207.
sehabhūmi, 89.
sehanipphediya, 104.
sekhasammatāni kūlāni, 49, 112, 114.
sejjā, 36.
sejjātarī, 143.
sejjāyara, 114;—*piṇḍa*, 114n.
sekha, 13, 89n, 95.

sekhiyā, 60, 228-30, 237, 237n, 240.
sela, 21, 119.
Sela, 99.
Senaka, 99.
senāsanaggahāpaka, 59, 206.
Senāsanakkhandhaka, 140.
senāsonapaññāpaka, 59, 206.
senāsanavattaṁ, 142.
Seniority and succession, problems of, 224.
seṭṭhī, 140, 145n.
Seyyasaka, 217.
siddhas, 13, 80, 84.
Siddhasenagaṇin, 165.
Sigālovādasutta, 43, 95.
Sīhā, 88.
sijjātarī, 193.
sikkhamānā, 42, 95, 162, 179.
sikkhāpaccakkhātaka, 154, 162.
sikkhāpada, 42, 43, 90, 90n, 93, 162, 162n.
sikkhāvvayas, 93, 94.
sīla, 86, 218.
śīla, 40.
silika, 148.
silīvaya, 148.
sīmā, 56, 60, 160, 161, 164, 199, 213-15; Christian equivalent of, 161.
Sīmālaṅkārasaṅgaha, 4; —*ṭikā*, 4.
simbali, 116.
siṁga, 21.
Siṁsumāragiri, 177.
sindhava, 145.
sinehapāna, 148.
siṅga, 119.
singiloṇakappa, 128n.
siṅgivera, 144.
sīpadī, 101.
sipatika, 144.
sirāveha, 148.
sirobatthi, 148.
sisa, 50.
sīsa, 119.
sīsābādha, 145n.
sīsābhitāpa, 145, 145n.
sisaga, 119.
Sisterhood, 134.
sītāloli, 146.
Śivabhūti, Sahaśramalla, 12n, 100, 100n.
Śivānandā, 88.
siveyyaka, 129.
sīya, 36.
Smṛtis, Brahmaṇical, 247.
Soma, sacrifice, 159.
Soṇakolivisa, 64.
Sopāka, 100.
sosa, 101, 146.
sosānikaṅgaṁ, 43, 67.
sotañjana, 145.
sotāpatti, 219
Sources, Brahmaṇical, 1, 61, 159, 169, 245; Buddhist, 1, 2, 77, 99, 102, 103, 109, 132, 136, 150, 159, 170, 174; Jaina, 2, 61, 77, 102, 104, 109, 114, 121, 136, 150, 159, 170, 174.
sovaṇṇa, 50, 119.
soviraṁ, 115.
śramaṇa-brāhmoṇas, 93.
śramaṇas, 184.
śrāmaṇera, 89n
śrāmaṇerī, 89n.
śrāvaka, 93; —*saṅgha*, 93.
Śrāvaṇa, 171, 171n, 175.
Śrāvasti, 88, 177, 178, 185.
śrāvikā, 93; —*saṅgha*, 93.
Śrenika, 88.
Stevenson, Mrs. S., 8.
Sthānāṅgasūtra, 27, 100, 106, 131, 207, 231.
Sthāpatyāputra, 78, 89.
sthāvarakāya, 31.

sthavira, 152.
Sthavirakalpikas, 21, 35, 123, 128.
suddhanta, 215.
Sudhamma, 217.
Sudharmā, 88.
Śūdras, 81.
sue, 222.
sui, 21.
sūī, 101.
sūīṁ, 130.
Suka, 89.
sūkara, 144.
sukkambarā samaṇā, 131, 132.
Sumaṅgala, 100 ; —mātā, 100.
Sumaṅgalappasādanī, 4.
Sunīta, 100
sūṇiya, 148.
supiṇaṁ, 111.
Supriyā, 88.
surāmerayamajjapamāda, 89.
sūri, 26.
Sūriyapaṇṇatti, 5.
susuka, 144.
Sūtra, period, 247.
Sūtrakṛtāṅga, 61, 62.
sutta, recitation of a, 57, 180.
suttaṁ, 130.
Suttanipāta, 2, 43.
Suttantika, 59, 204
Sutta (*piṭaka*) 2, 3.
Suttas, 201.
suvaṇṇa, 119.
suviṇā, 100.
Suyagaḍaṅga, 5, 237.
suyasampayā, 210.
Śvetāmbaras, 5, 14n, 15, 19, 27, 80, 81, 83, 129n, 130, 192.

tacarajana, 132.
tacchaṇa, 148.
tadappagāraṁ, 130.
tadubhaya, 37, 222, 229, 236.
tajjanīya, 180, 186; *—kamma*, 216, 217.
taka, 144.
takapaṇṇi, 144.
takapatti, 144
takka, 115, 116n.
takkara, 102.
Takṣaśilā, 144.
takurs, 114.
tembaloha, 50, 119.
taṇaphāsa, 36.
Taṇḍulaveyāliya, 6.
tapa, 30, 36, 39, 92, 107, 166, 192, 238; *abhintara—*, 37; *bāhira—*, 37.
tapovinaya, 166.
tappaṇa, 148.
Tapussa, 41, 85.
taraccha, 150.
tassapāpiyyasika, 219, 221, 221n.
Tathāgata, 74, 218.
tāu, 119.
tava, 36, 37, 106, 208, 222, 229, 230, 238.
Teacher, Buddhist, 98; Jaina, 98.
Teachers and disciples, 94; relation between (Buddhist), 45.
tecīvarikaṅgaṁ, 43, 67.
tela, 144.
telapāka, 145.
terāsi, 113.
Terasakaṇṇaṭīkā, 4.
teu, 182.
teukāiya, 31.
Texts, Buddhist, 85, 100; Indian religious, 107; Jaina, 100, 115, 117, 137, 148, 233, 239; Pāli, 61.
Ṭhāṇaṅga, 5.
thaṇḍila, 184.
thaṇḍilassasati, 183.
thera, 14, 38, 42, 89, 89n, 126, 152, 162, 204, 204n, 205, 225.

Theragāthā, 2, 44.
Theravāda, 3, 40, 179.
Theravādins, 79.
therī, 14, 42.
Therīgāthā, 2, 44.
thevira, 113.
theyyasaṁvāsaka, 45, 104, 154.
thullaccaya, 216, 219, 238, 238n.
thullakacchu, 145.
tigicchā, 111.
tikoṭiparisuddha, 110.
tiṇavatthāraka, 219, 222.
tinduka, 116.
Tipiṭaka, 43, 49, 246.
Tipiṭakālaṅkāra, 4.
tipu, 50, 119.
tiracchānagata, 45, 104, 154.
tiracchānavijjā, 234.
tiriḍa, 20, 131.
Tiriyapabbata, 4.
Tīrthaṅkara, 73, 74, 77, 210, 246.
Tīrthaṅkarahood, 81, 246.
tisaraṇagamana, 75.
tithi, 165.
titthiya, 50, 129, 131, 160, 168.
titthiyapakkantaka, 45, 104, 154.
Tittirajātaka, 225.
Traditions, Jaina, 212.
trasakāya, 31.
Trāyastriṁśa, 177.
tulasī, 144.
tumba, 189.
tumbāga, 116.
tumbakaṭāha, 50, 119.
tuṇḍiya, 120.
tuyāvaittā, 100.
tyāga, 192.
ubbāhikā, 197, 220, 221.
Ubbiri, 99.
ubhatobyañjanaka, 103, 154.
ubbhida, 145.
uccāsayanamahāsayana, 89.
ucchurasa, 49, 116.
ucchvāsas, 238.
uccārapāsavaṇa, 36.
uccārapraśravaṇa, 33.
udaka, 161.
udakasambhinna, 49, 116.
udakasāṭika, 44, 53, 134.
Udāna, 2.
udapāna, 54, 142.
udaravātābādha, 145.
udari, 148.
Uddakarāmaputta, 74.
uddesabhatta, 205.
uddesiyapiṇḍa, 18.
uddhavāta, 149.
Udena, 88.
udgama, 17.
udra, 131.
uḍubaddha, 189.
uggama, 112.
uggahanantaga, 134.
uggakula, 114.
uggamuppāyanesaṇāsuparisuddha, 110.
ujjāna, 185.
Ukkala, 85.
ukkhepanīya, 180;—*kamma*, 216, 217.
ulūkapakkha, 131.
Umāsvāti, 165.
ummataka, 154.
ummatta, 102, 113.
Universities, Buddhist, 144.
ūṇodariya, 39.
ūṇoyariyā, 37.
upādhyāya, 24, 26, 27, 73, 80, 94, 182, 235, 238.
Upadhye, Dr. A. N., 8.
upajjhāya, 41, 45, 46, 75-77, 95, 96, 105, 106, 203, 204, 219, 226; qualifications of, 59.
Upaka, 73.
Upāli, 59, 88, 204.

Upāṅgas, 5.
Upaniṣad, 247.
Upaniṣadic, 81.
upasampa, 71n.
upasampadā, 45, 71-73, 75-77, 83, 103, 105, 186, 204, 213, 214, 217, 225 ; authority competent to confer, 45.
upasampadāpekkhā, 76, 105.
upasampanna, 42, 71n, 89.
upāsaka, 41, 85, 165, 179, 180 ; duties of a Jaina, 87.
upāsikā, 41, 85, 179, 180.
upasthāpanā, 72.
upaṭṭhānasālā, 51, 52, 54, 97, 125, 127, 142.
upavāsa, 159, 167 ; in the Śramaṇic tradition, 168.
upavasatha, 159, 167 ; in the Vedic tradition, 168.
uposatha, 43, 47, 48, 55, 58, 82, 92, 109, 112, 159-63, 163n, 164-67, 168n, 174, 186, 191, 203, 205, 213, 214, 238, 243; *adhiṭṭhāna*—, 57; *ariya*—, 57, 164 ; Brahmanical, 159; *gopālaka*—, 57, 164, 166 ; in Jainism, 165 ; in the Śramaṇic tradition, 168 ; —*kamma*, 163; *nigaṇṭha*—, 57, 164 ; *pārisuddhi*—, 57, 162, 164; pre-Śramaṇic origin, 168; *saṅgha*—, 57, 164; *saṅgha-sāmaggi*—, 57, 164 ; types of, 57.
uposathāgāra; 56, 160, 161.
Uposathakkhandhaka, 164.
uposathika, 205.
Uppalavaṇṇā, 99.
uppātaṁ, 111.
uppāyaṇadosa, 111.
Uruvela Kassapa, 99, 156.
usagga, 80.
usiṇa, 36.
usīra, 144.
utpāda, 17.
utsarga, 165.
Uttarādhyayana(sūtra), 15, 90. 98, 133.
Uttarajjhayaṇa, 6.
uttarāsaṅga, 53, 133, 136.
Uttaravinicchaya, 4.
uttarimanussadhamma, 231, 236, 237.
uṭṭhāna, 182
uvabhogaparibhogaparimāṇa, 94.
uvajjhāya, 38, 207, 208, 208n, 209, 211, 212, 214.
Uvāsagadasāo, 5.
uvasagge, 16.
uvasaṁpayā, 94.
uvaṭṭaṇa, 150.
uvaṭṭhāvaṇā, 72.
uvvaṭṭana, 148.
uyara, 148.
vaca, 144.
vacanasampayā, 211.
vācanāsampayā, 211.
vacattha, 144.
vaccakuṭi, 54, 97, 142; —*vattaṁ*, 142n.
vacchāṇubandhitā, 100.
Vācissara, 4.
vaḍabha, 101, 102.
vaha, 36.
vāhi, 102.
Vaidya, Dr P.L., 8.
Vaira, 12.
Vaiśāli, 41, 82, 88, 176-78.
Vaiṣṇava, 118.
Vaiśya, 114.
vaiyāvṛtya, 39.
vaja, 183.
Vajirabuddhiṭīkā, 4.
Vajra, 202.
Vajrasena, 202.
vāk, 36.

vāka, 131.
vālakambala, 131.
valua, 188.
vamaṇa, 148.
vāmaṇa, 102.
vammika, 161.
vaṇa, 150,
vaṇassaīkāiyā, 31.
vandana, 166.
Vaṇhidasāo, 6.
Vāṇijyagrāma, 87, 88, 177, 178.
vaṇīmaga, 111.
vāra, 117n.
vāradhovana, 117, 117n.
varṇāśramadharma, 246,
Vārttaka, 32.
vasa, 150.
Vāsabhakṣatriya, 88.
vāsattāna, 187, 189.
Vāseṭṭhī, 99, 100, 100n.
vassā, 58, 172-75, 180, 182, 185-87.
Vassāvāsa, 23, 43, 48, 55, 57, 82, 172, 176, 178, 180, 191, 206, 235, 243; universality of the custom among Indian mendicant Orders, 169.
vassikasāṭika, 53, 134, 136, 187.
Vassūpanāyikakkhandhaka, 174.
Vasumati, 77.
vāta, 150.
vātābādha, 145.
vātie, 103.
Vaṭṭagāmaṇi, of Ceylon, 2.
vāu, 182.
vāukāiyā, 31.
Vavahāra, 6, 222.
vāyaga, 207, 211.
vāyaṇā, 16.
veāvacca, 38.
vedanaṭṭa, 154.
Vedāṅga, the term, 1n.
Vedic, 81; lore, 247.
vegacchī, 135.
veḷuriya, 50, 119.
Veluvanavihāra, 185.
Verañjā, 177.
vevaggi, 101.
vevai, 148.
Vibhaṅga, 2.
vibhitaka, 144.
Vidyādhara, 202.
vigaḍipaḍibaddha, 95.
vihagagaī, 100.
vihāra, 54, 55, 57, 58, 88, 96-98, 140-142, 144, 160, 174, 179, 183, 206.
viịjā, 111.
vikālabhojana, 89.
vikṛiis, 115, 150.
vilaṅga, 144.
Vimalasāra, 4.
vimaṁsā, 95.
Vimānavatthu, 2.
Vimativinodanī Ṭīkā, 4.
vinaya, the second internal austerity of the Jainas, 37, 166.
Vinaya, 59, 86, 93, 162, 204, 218, 219, 224, 243, 244; background of the Buddhist, 61; Buddhist, 68, 176; meaning and scope of the word, 1; nature of the, 64; Pāli, 96, 108, 169-71, 174, 181, 205; rules, 66; salient features of Buddhist, 40.
Vinayadhara, 59, 105, 204.
Vinayagaṇṭhī, 4.
Vinayagaṇṭhīpada, 4.
Vinayaguḷhatthadīpanī, 4.
Vinayālaṅkāra Anuṭīkā, 4.
Vinayālaṅkāraṭīkā, 4.
Vinaya (piṭaka), 2, 3, 6, 50, 60, 65, 67, 197, 213, 232, 244.
Vinayasamuṭṭhānadīpanī, 4.
Vinayasaṅgaha, 4.

Vinayasaṅgaha-aṭṭhakathā, 4.
Vinayasutta, 98.
Vinayatthamañjūsā, 3.
Vinayavinicchaya, 4; —*ṭīkā*, 4.
Vipākasūtra, 148.
Vīratthava, 6.
virecana, 146.
vireyaṇa, 148.
viriya, 106, 208.
Viśākhā, 88.
visapāna, 146.
Visuddhimagga, 141.
vītarāgas, 13, 80.
viusagga, 37, 38, 222, 229, 230.
vivāda, 218.
Vivāgasuya, 5.
vivajjia, 113.
vivaṭaka, 221.
vivega, 37, 222, 229, 230, 237, 240.
Viyāhapaṇṇatti (also called *Bhagavatsuya*), 5.
vrati, 165.
vuḍḍha, 104, 113.
vuggāhiya, 95.
Vyavahāra(sūtra), 209, 210, 229, 233, 234, 236, 237, 246.
Weber, 5n, 7n.
Williams, M.M., 159n.
Winternitz, Prof. M., 5n, 8.
Yāgñavalkya, 212n.
yāgu, 49, 114 ; —*bhājaka*, 59, 205.
Yakṣinī, 83.
Yamaka, 2.
Yasa, 40, 41, 75, 86, 88, 218.
yatatta, 63.
yathāsanthatikaṅgaṁ, 45, 67.
yatidharmas, 35, 36. 91.
yatis, Brahmaṇical, 243.
yebhuyyasikā, 218, 219, 221.
yojana, 24, 124, 139, 161, 184.

३३६४

ERRATA

Read	In place of	Page	Line
employing	emplying	1	12
treatise	trealise	1	31
sometimes	somestimes	3	18
Mahāvīra	Mahāvāra	7	8
this humble	that this humble	8	3
Bhāṣya	*Bkāṣya*	12n	8
pratikramaṇa	*pratikramṇa*	13	19
of the Pārśva's	to the Pārśva's	14n	5
later	latter	14n	13
aupagrāhika	*aūpagrāhika*	19	10
sāṇayaṁ	*sā ṅayaṁ*	20	16
, *arhatula*	*arhatula*	20	16
perversion	pervertion	22	19
of the month	on the month	23	18
ācārya	*ācāraya*	26	6
as old as	an old as	27	25
circumstances	circustances	28	15
should	sould	32	8
consenting to others	consenting others	32	17
the	tbe	39	5
Piṭakas	piṭakas	40	11
order, requisites	order requisites	40	15
allowed	alloyed	40	17
Burma	Berma	44	14
the Buddha	Buddha	44	27
religious	religions	48	2
retreat	retreal	48	13
regard	regards	48	29
monks	momks	51	3
vested	vasted	54	8
Residence	Recidence	54	10
Navakammika	*Narakammika*	54	18
upaṭṭhānasālā	(*upaṭṭhānasālā*	54	25
cures	curses	55	6
uposathāgāra	*uposothāgāra*	56	1
The *Mahāvagga*	*Mahāvagga*	57	1
(rain-retreat)	rain-retreat)	57	10

ERRATA

The *Sūtrakṛtāṅga*	*Sūtrakṛtāṅga*	61	24
The Bhagavadgītā	*Bhagavadagītā*	62	1
the	ṭḥe	62	6
Buddhist	Bundhist	64	32
Saṅgha	Sangha	76	5
(*antarāyikadhamma*)	*antarāyikadhamma*	76	34
presence	presencc	80	30
a good number of monks like the Buddhist,	a good number of monks, it, like the Buddhist,	80	30-31
Tīrthaṅkarahood	Thīrthaṅkarahood	81	25
alaṁ	*alṁ*	82n	1
Ānanda	Ananda	88	27
jātarūparajatapaṭiggahaṇa	*jātaruparajatapaṭiggahana*	90	1
parīsahas	*parisahas*	92	4-5
Order of their own.	Order of their ...	92	last line
vaccakuṭi	*vaccakuti*	97	11
hatthachinnaṁ	*hatthacinnaṁ*	102	6
it held up	held it up	105	17
qualities	abilities	106	6
summum bonum	*snmmum bonum*	107	14
karanīyo	*karaniyo*	108n	4
mūlakamma	*muūlakamma*	111	36
Similarly	Similary	115	18
jīramāṇī	*jiramāṇī*	116n	10
fore	force	123	7
Mahāvagga	*Mchāvagga*	129	5
as it was	as was	129	15
identical	indentical	129n	12
this	chis	129n	13
occur	accur	130	14
little	littie	130n	6
fourfold	fourfould	133	4
allowable to the	allowable the	133	20
cuṇama	*chuṇama*	145	9
purgatives	pergatives	148n	7
already	alredy	151	22
nigaṇṭha	nigṇṭha	164	33
connection	conncction	167	13
the section	the the section	170	3
months	moths	172	19
getting good	getting a good	176	1
Pṛṣṭhacampā	Pṛṣṭhacamā	177	22

during the	during the the	184	7
there are	there is	188n	3
its other	is other	201	21
ekācāryaparivārah̤	ekācaryaparivārah̤	201n	14
Gaccha	*Gāccha*	202	21
sākhā	*sakhā*	202	21
samānasaṁvāsaka	*samana saṁvāsaka*	202	33
Chedasūtras,	Chedasūtras	208	13
Ạvas N	*Āyas N*	208n	8
Āyariya	*Āariya*	210n	5
deśoasyāstīti	desoasyastīti	211n	1
Canon	Canon with	212	11
parivāsa	*parsvāsa*	215n	7
bad conduct	had conduct	216	22
Āpattādhikaraṇa	*Āpāttādhikaraṇa*	218	22
Santarā Cheda	*Santarā Gheda*	223	14
Seniority	Senioriiy	224	24
omission	emission	235	18
Pacittiya	*Pcittiya*	236	33
Dubbhāsita	*Dubbāsita*	238	8
kāyotsarga	*kāyotsraga*	238	25
asceticism	asceticsism	243	1
perhaps	herhaps	244	8

श्री गणेश वर्णी दि. जैन (शोध) संस्थान
33६५
[illegible] (का. हि. वि. (प.) वाराणसी